

217 L 26.

A

NEW AND FAITHFUL
TRANSLATION
OF
LETTERS

FROM

Mr. L' ABBÉ * * *,

HEBREW PROFESSOR in the University of * * *.

TO

The Rev. Dr. BENJAMIN KENNICOTT.

WITH

An introductory PREFACE,

In Answer to a late Pamphlet published with a View
to vindicate Dr. KENNICOTT from the Arguments
and Facts alledged against him in the *French Letters*.

AND

An APPENDIX,

CONTAINING

Some short Remarks on Dr. KENNICOTT's Proposals
for printing by Subscription a new Edition of the
Hebrew Bible.

WITHOUT THE IMPRIMATUR OF F. T. A. RICCHINI, OR
THE RECOMMENDATION OF ARCHBISHOP ASSEMANI.

L O N D O N :

Printed for G. ROBINSON, in Pater-noster-Row : J. ROBSON,
in New-Bond-Street ; J. WALTER, at Charing-Cross ;
E. and C. DILLY, in the Poultry ; Mr. PRINCE, at Oxford ;
and Mr. WOODYER, at Cambridge. MDCCLXXIII.

TRANSLATION

NEW AND FAITHFUL

TRANSLATION

OF

LETTERS

FROM

MR. L. ABBE

Professor in the University of



The Rev. Dr. BENJAMIN KENNICOTT

(Price 6d.)

A
NEW AND FAITHFUL
TRANSLATION
OF
LETTERS
FROM

Mr. L'ABBÉ * * *,
HEBREW PROFESSOR in the University of * * *.

TO
The Rev. Dr. BENJAMIN KENNICOTT.

[Price 2s. 6d.]

NEW AND REVISED

TRANSLATION

OF THE

NEW TESTAMENT

WITH

INTRODUCTION

AND

APPENDIX

BY

THE

AMERICAN

A N
I N T R O D U C T O R Y
P R E F A C E.

By the T R A N S L A T O R.

AS the *French* Letters, which are spoken of in one of our periodical Publications, and said to be a *bloody attack* upon Dr. Kennicott, contain some curious matter, a Translation of them was much wished for, that those who did not understand the Language might reap the benefit of them. A Translation was talked of for a while, and expected to make its appearance; but all on a sudden there was a dead silence; it was by some means or other suppressed, and we heard no more of it. A thing was published, called *A Letter to a Friend*, pretending to give an account of the *French* Letters; but no better idea could be formed of them from that, than of the man's house from the brick which he carried in his pocket by way of sample. And, indeed, there is great reason to suppose, that the Author's intention was to put a stop to any farther enquiry; for his Letter seemed purposely calculated to stifle the evidence of the *French* Letters, instead of fairly stating the Charges they contained against the Doctor. This gave occasion to the present Translation, the Author of it being desirous, that the Learned in general might be acquainted with the real merit of the *French* Letters; that the Person, to whom the *English* Letter was written, might see how his Friend had imposed upon him; and that the Doctor himself (who, it seems, says he is not all affected by the abuse, as he calls it, of the *French* Letters, because he does

B

not

not understand the Language) might be able to judge of the truth of what is urged against him, and be properly affected by it. Who is the Author of the *Letter to a Friend*, one cannot absolutely determine; but if one might be allowed to follow that Author's own rule, and judge from what he calls *internal evidence*, one should conclude it to be the Doctor himself. There is the same regard for truth, the same strength of reasoning, and the same poignancy of stile so conspicuous in the Doctor's Writings; and the Translations from the *French Letters*, which occur in it, shew plainly, that the Author does not understand the Language; so that if it is not the Doctor, it is *alter idem*, it is one who answers exactly to the definition of a Friend, that he is a *second self*. Whoever he is, it may not be amiss to take some notice of the heavy Charges he exhibits against the Author or Authors, as he will have it, of the *French Letters*, and to shew how weakly they are supported; that people may not be dissuaded from reading them by the unfavourable account he has given of them.

His first accusation against the *French Writers* is their want of honesty, in charging Dr. Kennicott with saying, "that the two Editions of the *Hebrew Bible*, "that of *Bomberg* at *Venice*, and that of Cardinal " *Ximenés* at *Complutum*, were made from Manuscripts furnished by the *Jews*; and that therefore the " Manuscripts were vitious, and the Text of those " Editions corrupted." Now if the Doctor really says nothing like this, it is pity he should be charged with it; but still, I think, the Writers of the *French Letters* may not deserve the severe censure passed upon them by this Author; for suppose they should have read the Doctor's Work only in the Translation of the learned Gentleman at *Leipsic*, who admired it so greatly, that he could not rest till he had translated

lated it into *Latin*; he may have erred in one instance as well as another; and we know that the Doctor could not help complaining of the Translation, for making him, though a very modest man, to speak and correct most CONFIDENTLY. If, therefore, they have been misled by a Translation, it is no impeachment of their integrity; and the Doctor's Friend should have been more cautious how he reproached them as men of no conscience, for pretending to criticise a Book written in a Language they did not understand, lest the censure should light where he would not wish. But let us see what the Doctor doth really say upon the subject. In his first Dissertation, p. 247, he says, "that the very many, "and very material mistakes in the Copies of the "sacred Books of the Old Testament, were at first "introduced by the late and faulty Manuscripts "furnished by the *Jews*, and which have hitherto "been retained, from a false notion of the *Jewish* "exactness in transcribing, in concurrence with the "unaccountable authority of an imperfect, contradictory, and corrupted *Masora*."—In his second Dissertation, p. 475, speaking of the two Editions before mentioned, he says, "though they should "have been both printed, not from any previously "printed Copy, but directly from Manuscripts; yet "as they were both printed *by men who were, or had "been Jews*, from such Manuscripts as were uniformly corrected by the same *Masora*, they would "exhibit almost universally the same Text." Now, if, according to the Doctor, the mistakes were introduced by late and faulty Manuscripts, furnished by *Jews*; if the *Masora* is imperfect, contradictory, and corrupted, and the two Editions in question were printed from Manuscripts, uniformly corrected by the same *Masora*, by men who were or had been

Jews, I do not see that the Authors of the *French Letters* are very wide of the mark in charging the Doctor with saying, that the Text of those Editions was corrupted, and the Manuscripts were *therefore* vitious, because furnished by the *Jews*; and I think their characters will appear in the eye of the world as fair at least as the Doctor's, who infers from the words of the Cardinal in his Dedication, *castigatissima omni ex parte, vetustissimaeque exemplaria*, that his Edition was printed from *late and faulty Manuscripts, corrected by a corrupted Masora*.

Another proof of dishonesty in the Writers of the *French Letters*, as exhibited by the Pamphleteer, is their charging Dr. Kennicott with an intention to alter the *Hebrew Bible*, and to publish the Text as corrected by himself. "The only pretence brought for this charge, he says, is a misapplied quotation from Dr. Kennicott's first Dissertation, published in 1753, which was six years before he undertook his present Work; and he has been assured, that when he published his second Dissertation, in 1759, he had not even then resolved to undertake this Work himself, if it should be undertaken at all." By this it seems as if the Work was in a manner begun, before the Doctor had even resolved to do it at all; for he set about it in the beginning of the year 1760, which was the time he himself says he published his second Dissertation; and yet, as his Friend has been assured, he had not then resolved upon it. This may appear strange, considering that it seems to have been one design of the Dissertations to point himself out as the proper person to undertake the Work; and the truth of it might have been questioned, had not the Doctor, whose veracity may be always depended upon, given his own word for it. Indeed, the late Archbishop of *Canterbury* pressed him to the undertaking,

aking as far back as the year 1757, as the Doctor informs us in his Introduction to the Annual Accounts of the Collations; he wrote to him twice about it in the year 1758; the Delegates at Oxford pitched on him for the Work the same year; but yet, such was his extreme diffidence, it was not, as he tells us himself, till after he had been still more strenuously exhorted to it by several great persons, and in particular by the Archbishop of *Canterbury*, that he could be prevailed with, in 1760, to give up his life to this laborious undertaking.

And is there really no pretence for charging him with a design of altering the printed *Hebrew Text*, but a *misapplied* quotation from his first Dissertation? Is there no intimation of it likewise in the second Dissertation? Let us hear what he says in both. In his first Dissertation, p. 565, 566, where he expresses his earnest wishes for a new Translation, he asks, "What it is that is to be translated?" He hopes, "*not the present printed Hebrew Text*, but "*the Text, when such Corrections are admitted as will be pointed out*" But as some learned men, who allow mistakes in the printed *Hebrew Copies*, are of opinion, that, *how fully soever any various readings can prove themselves Original, yet none should be admitted into the Text of the printed Edition*; he wishes he could see the sentiment in its full force; but he must beg leave to confess himself at present *differently persuaded* on that point. He then divides the various Readings into three Classes—the first, *certainly true*—the second, *probably true*—the third *possibly true*. And he presumes, p. 569, speaking of the first Class, that their *certain truth* gives them a *certain right* to be restored to their original stations. These are the Doctor's words, and they are so plain, that surely the charge of a design to alter the printed *Hebrew*

Text, cannot be said to be grounded only on a *misapplied* quotation. In his second Dissertation, p. 582, he again asks, *what sort of Hebrew Text* is to be the rule of right, or standard from which to print a new Translation? p. 597, he says, "what nobler tribute can *we render unto the Lord for all his benefits*, than to rescue his sacred oracles from the errors introduced by the mistakes of men? *Every word of God* was at first *pure*. Let us, therefore, *take away the dross from the silver*; let us separate the *precious from the vile*." And he concludes, p. 598, — "When the sentences, words, and letters now taken from the sacred *Hebrew Volume* shall be restored; when those now interpolated shall be removed; when those now transposed or altered shall be corrected; when those now grown obscure shall be made clear, and the *whole* again appear perfectly worthy of its DIVINE ORIGIN:"

"Then *shall its doctrine drop as the rain*," &c.

This is what the Doctor says on the subject in his *second* Dissertation; and is it then only from a *misapplied* quotation in the *first*, that the design of altering the printed *Hebrew Text* may be charged upon him? Does it not appear pretty clearly both from the *first* and *second* Dissertation, that the Doctor's original intention was to alter the printed *Hebrew Text*? And would not an impartial jury, from this evidence, acquit the *French Writers* of any dishonest intention in their representation of the Fact? But we are told by the Pamphleteer, that "it has certainly been declared publicly, and affirmed in print repeatedly by Dr. Kennicott, that he will in his Edition publish every word from the Edition of *Vander Hooght*, without designedly adding or omitting one single letter; and that if the *French Gentlemen* did not know this, they should have been
"ashamed

" ashamed to have pronounced so confidently upon
 " this subject without previous information; and if
 " they *did know* it, they should be still more ashamed."
 Now really, if the Writers of the *French Letters* are
 a Society of Capuchins in the Convent of St. *Honoré*,
 in *Paris*, as the Pamphleteer says they are, I do
 not see, that they are bound to know *all*, that the Doc-
 tor may declare publicly on the subject here in *Eng-
 land*; especially if he is inconsistent and frivolous in
 his declarations; and as to the salvo of the paren-
 thesis (*not with a new Text*) in the state of the Col-
 lations for the year 1760 (which I suppose, is what
 is meant by the Doctor's affirming in print repeatedly)
 I think they may be justified in paying no attention
 to it, as it seems to have been inserted only to serve
 a present purpose, and is plainly an after-thought.
 They had the evidence of the Doctor's two Dis-
 sertations, the last of which was published in 1760,
 according to his own account, that his design was to
 alter the present *Hebrew Text*; and there is no inti-
 mation to the contrary in the Proposals which were
 published at the beginning of that year. When
 therefore the Doctor says, at the latter end of the
 same year, without assigning any reason for his
 sudden change of mind, that " his new Edition of
 " the *Hebrew Bible* shall be printed (*not with a new
 " Text*);" might they not naturally conclude, that,
 as " the reward of his labours," was an object he ever
 kept in view; this was done (to use his own words)
 for the " encouragement of *future* Subscribers." As
 the Doctor acknowledges in his first Dissertation, that
 many learned men objected to a *new Text*, though
 not to a collation of Manuscripts, he could not hope
 for *their* pecuniary assistance upon his first Plan; and
 therefore the *French Writers*, having had some ex-
 perience of the Doctor's dexterity, might look upon

this parenthesis only as a bait thrown out to pacify some of his old Subscribers, and invite some new ones; which having answered its end, the Doctor might revert to his old Plan, in which he had persisted for seven years, declare himself “*differently persuaded* on that point”, and urge once more the necessity of a *new Text*.

The *Judgment* of our *French* Writers is called in question for supposing, that most of the Manuscripts we have now are modern, and were written for sale by mercenary *Jews*, when the curiosity of the learned began to call for such commodities: and that this is the reason why *Hebrew* Manuscripts are much more plentiful in this age than at the time when the Text of the Edition of *Complutum* was settled by Cardinal *Ximenés*. This is a very natural, and, when all things are considered, a very probable conjecture: but the Pamphleteer, instead of confuting it, treats it with scorn, and avers that nothing he “ever met with before” comes up to it for absurdity.” I see none of this absurdity: I am rather persuaded, that no *Hebrew* Critic, who has a good meaning, would treat the affair with so much levity. When the Study of Coins came into vogue, mercenary artists took advantage of the public curiosity, and produced spurious coins in great abundance, with such a face of antiquity, that the best judges might be, and without doubt were, frequently imposed upon. So common was this traffic, that Receipts are given in books of Art for overcasting counterfeit Coins with the genuine rust of antiquity. The *Jews*, who are never slack upon such occasions, manufactured great numbers of antique *Israelitish* shekels, which Mr. *Wise*, a learned Antiquarian of *Oxford*, in his work upon Coins, hath treated with the contempt they deserve, pronouncing the generality of them to be baubles of modern original. Will not the
same

same mercenary spirit, which produces counterfeit Coins, produce counterfeit Manuscripts? And cannot Art add a false date, and a false complexion, which shall give a very promising appearance of antiquity? When Libraries were thought imperfect without some *Hebrew* Remains, and there was so fair an opportunity of making money, would the *Jews* neglect it, and go to sleep? Were *converted Jews* so dishonest (in Doctor *Kennicott's* opinion) to Cardinal *Ximenes* as to impose *late and faulty* Manuscripts upon him; and were the *unconverted* so conscientious as never to write for sale, and make money of *Christian* credulity? The State of many Manuscripts, which have an appearance of being hastily or carelessly written for mercenary purposes, is scarcely to be accounted for on any other principle. I will tell the Pamphleteer a secret: I had the luck to meet with an *Hebraist*, who had carefully inspected many of the Manuscripts collated by Doctor *Kennicott*: he declared they were for the most part wretched beyond conception, and that he suspected them either to have been written by boys, or by ignorant Scribblers to make a penny of them. If such an accident as this is reckoned among the impossibilities, and the belief of it is an unparalleled absurdity; it will then be no injury to Doctor *Kennicott* to suppose, that he is to this hour unprovided against such an imposition, and never thought it worth his while to search for any criteria, by which an authentic Manuscript might be distinguished from a counterfeit, that so the *precious* might be separated from the *vile*. I have no more doubt that there have been, and now are, many spurious *Hebrew* Manuscripts, than that there are spurious *Shekels* and other Coins, things made for sale, and for no other end; especially as the art was in the hands of the *Jews*, who never were wanting in ingenuity, and have always accounted it one part of their pro-

profession to chouse Christians of their money by counterfeit wares of every other kind. The credit of Doctor Kennicott's undertaking is much affected by this consideration ; and people will not think it has a good appearance, that his Vindicator should dismiss it with so much haste and indifference. The *French* Gentlemen are persons of sagacity, and I can give the Pamphleteer a proof, that their conjectures are not quite the most extravagant in the world. They conjectured, that Doctor Kennicott would endeavour to silence their accusations, as he has hitherto answered his opponents in *England*, by pleading that *his time is the time of the public* : and behold, the little scrap thrown out in his vindication opens very solemnly with the old Story, that no public notice of the *French* Letters " can be expected from him, who is diligently " engaged in the preparation of his Work for the Press." The reason Doctor Kennicott has hitherto given for his silence, seems very improper for the purpose ; and some may think it does not proceed from a spirit of Truth, but partly from vanity, and partly from convenience. His time, he says, is the time of the public : if so, surely the public has some right to know, whether or not it is employed, as his opponents say, injudiciously and impertinently, upon worthless materials, with a much greater prospect of danger than advantage to the sacred Writings ? In answer to all these things, he opposes nothing but the great value of his time to the public, which in plain *English* means nothing more than the popularity of his undertaking. But what is that ? Is it absurd, incredible, impossible, that an undertaking should become popular upon partial representations ? Has the Public never been deceived by the promises of Projectors ? We all know the power of popularity. When a project has obtained a certain degree of the public confidence, the Projector

jector himself is seated upon the Clouds, superior to contradiction, and ought by no means to waste the time of the public in descending to his own vindication. And yet, as I said before, it is highly probable that Doctor *Kennicott* himself hath descended from his station, and written this very Pamphlet which apologizes for his not writing. There is a turn of expression and phraseology peculiar to the celebrated Collator ; and if he will read over the Pamphlet once more with the hint I am now giving him, I dare appeal to his own judgment, that he will discover the substitution therein affected, of Doctor *Kennicott's* friend for Doctor *Kennicott* himself, to be rather over-acted.

The Pamphleteer has a farther accusation of disingenuity against the Writers of the *French Letters*, for saying that Doctor *Kennicott* has allowed, " that the " mistakes, which he thinks he sees in the Text, are " not found in the places immediately relative to the " faith and practice of mankind ;" whereas the Doctor only says, they " are chiefly found," &c. But the *French Writers* are acknowledged to have quoted the passage truly at p. 100, so that they do not appear to have had any design to impose on their Readers, or misrepresent the Doctor's meaning. At the Conclusion, when they sum up the whole of what has been said, they infer the futility of the Doctor's work from this passage, which I think they might fairly do ; as I believe no person who reads it would suspect, that there were any mistakes of consequence in the present Text ; and, indeed, whatever advantage the Doctor might intend to make of the qualifying word *chiefly*, there is little doubt that his first design was, that his Readers should understand the passage in the sense which the *French Writers* have given to it. But which way soever those Gentlemen had represented it, they must have

have had good luck to escape the censure of the Pamphleteer; for the Doctor is safe, whether you charge him with asserting that the present Text *is* or *is not* materially corrupt, as will appear by a few Passages laid together.

Dissert. I. p. 11—In justice to the present Text, it must be (and is here with pleasure) observed,—that the many variations and errors, which do, in fact, occur, are chiefly found in places not immediately relative to the faith and practice of Mankind.

Dissert. I. p. 301. I most readily acknowledge the *accuracy* and *truth*, which happily obtain in the printed Editions, in matters relative to our faith and practice, and from the harmony of the present *Hebrew* Manuscripts, with all the antient Versions, in these most important articles, I think *that point* clearly demonstrable.

Dissert. I. p. 247. And this too a point, which is certainly important enough to deserve the serious attention of the learned; namely—That there have been made in the Copies of the sacred Books of the Old Testament, *very many*, and *very material* MISTAKES; which have greatly injured the true sense of the inspired Authors.

Dissert. I. p. 557—It is not only expedient, but necessary to point out the Mistakes introduced by Transcribers, and to re-establish the original readings: to separate the *pure gold* from the Dross and Defilement, which it has contracted by time and accidents. For we may well say with the Author of the Lamentations, ch. iv. 1. *How is the gold become dim! How is the most fine gold changed*!*

I have now gone through the principal objections of the Pamphleteer against the *French* Writers, and I trust they have been obviated to the Satisfaction

* These words were spoken of *Jerusalem* in its most degenerate state, when there was no soundness in it; and with what sense or propriety can they be accommodated to the *Hebrew* Text, when the Doctor *with pleasure* observes, that it is not materially corrupt? More to the same purpose will occur in the Letters themselves.

of

of the Reader. As to some others, with which he makes a great parade, such as their mistaking No. 11, for *two*, instead of *eleven*, &c. and taking advantage of some Errors of the Press in the Doctor's Dissertations for Errors of his own, they are too trifling to deserve any notice. But there are, on the other hand, many material charges exhibited against the Doctor by the *French* Writers; and what has the Pamphleteer to offer in vindication of his Friend? Why, really, nothing at all. He defends none of the Doctor's Criticisms, which are exposed and confuted in the *French* Letters; nor does he invalidate any of the evidence that is brought to prove the Doctor's ignorance of the *Hebrew* Language. He acknowledges the account of the wretched state of the Manuscripts the Doctor has collated, particularly the *Cambridge* Manuscript, No. 68, to be true; and he justifies the collating such Manuscripts for correcting the printed Text, though the Doctor's own objection against the printed Text, in his second Dissertation, p. 582, is, that it agrees with Manuscripts, *which contain various instances of error and nonsense*. He allows the truth of what is said as to the qualifications of those whom the Doctor employed in his Work at *Oxford*, that many of them knew nothing more of the *Hebrew* Language than the Alphabet; and he pleads for their superior fitness on that account, perhaps obliquely intending it as a recommendation of the Doctor at the same time; but surely ignorance was never so sanctified! It is plain that he does not want for inclination to defend the Doctor; he has urged every thing he can in his behalf, and as what he has said amounts to nothing, it is to be presumed there is nothing to be said for him. I would not be understood to subscribe to every thing, that the *French* Writers have advanced as Critics and Hebraists; but

so far as the Doctor and his Work are the subject of their Animadversions, I think it must be allowed, that they have proved their point, and that their remonstrances are deserving of the public attention.

When Bishop *Walton's* Polyglott Bible first came out, Mr. *E—*, then a Scholar of *Cambridge*, and much given to the *Eastern* Languages, was determined to purchase it ; but it was too expensive for his pocket ; so he sold his Bed from under him, and took up his lodging in a large chest, which held his wearing apparel. It happened one morning as he was about to emerge from his chest to attend the College prayers, the lid fell down upon him with a snap-lock, and shut him in past recovery. There he lay in durance, till a servant of the College happily coming into his Chamber released him before he was suffocated. Such an accident could not remain a secret : it got to the ears of his Father, who pitying his distress, and applauding the zeal which had occasioned it, redeemed his bed, and left him in full possession of his Polyglott. The usefulness of that great and noble Work to the critical Divine has never been disputed, and it is now an honour to the *English* Nation. Many magnificent things have been said, and great expectations have been raised, concerning the utility of Doctor *Kennicott's* Collations ; but if the objections in the following Letters against him and his Work cannot be better obviated than by a little evasive Pamphlet ashamed of its own original, no Academic will lie in a Chest for the sake of buying *Kennicott's* various Readings of the *Hebrew* Bible.

ADVERTISEMENT

Prefixed to the

ORIGINAL LETTERS.

IF the general observation be true, that Works of Learning and Merit only are the Subjects of Criticism, Dr. Kennicott ought to be pleased with my Examination of his Performance. I hope he will think himself obliged to me for it, and will thank me for my kind assistance in making his Book known and relished in the different Countries of *Europe*, and for procuring it the Sale that it deserves. I have divided my Reflections into Letters, to prevent confusion in the Subjects.

The first is only a kind of Introduction to the matter.

The second will, perhaps, displease some of the Gentlemen Librarians, as they will there find their Manuscripts rather roughly handled. I make my apologies to them for it; but it is neither their fault nor mine, that their Records are no better.

The third, which is fuller of *Hebrew* Passages, is absolutely necessary, both for discovering the genius of the *Hebrew* Language, and for shewing the Doctor's ignorance of it, his blunders, and want of accuracy, together with the uselessness and inconsistency of his pretended Corrections.

As

As to the fourth and fifth, as well as the *Postscript*, if they should any way offend the Doctor, I should be very sorry for it. However, he has the remedy in his own power ; he may answer me, and resolve the few difficulties I propose to him : and I beg of him, for his own sake, to do me that honour. There is nothing else wanting to compleat his glory, but to put to silence a *French* Hebraist, which he certainly will do, if the reasons he offers to me are as strong as those, which he made use of to demolish the Hebraists in *England*.

It is to be observed, that Dr. *Kennicott* silenced his Adversaries by the weight of Authority alone, and giving them no other reason or answer, than that *his time was the time of the Public*.

L E T T E R I.

YOU are absolutely resolved, it seems, Sir, to procure yourself a name in the world. Indeed, a better way of doing it could not have been devised than that which you have hit upon. Both hemispheres already resound with your praises; your undertaking is applauded on all sides. The printed *Hebrew* Text, it is said, is corrupt; but a learned man of the first Class is about to restore it to it's original purity. What a happiness to the present age! What a blessing to posterity! Give me leave here to join my feeble voice to the shouts of your Admirers, and congratulate *England* on having produced so great a man. Yes, Sir, your Work is a Master-piece; it seems to me a finished Picture, whose only fault (if it be one) is having too much light in it. I think some shades, properly thrown in, would soften the glare; permit me, I beg of you, to try my hand for this purpose.

There is no man, who would not esteem, as the most valuable treasure, a perfect Edition of the *Hebrew* Bible; for I do not deny that there are some Errors, though very few, and of little consequence, in those we have at present. But how many things are necessary to obtain it! There must be good Manuscripts, a thorough knowledge of *Hebrew*, a sincere love for the *Christian* Religion, great self-diffidence, and, above all, an entirely disinterested mind.

C

There

There must be *good ancient Manuscripts*, that we may collate carefully the printed Text with them, observe the difference between them, and endeavour to discover the reasons of it.

A thorough knowledge of Hebrew is necessary, that the literal and figurative meaning of the Text may be attentively examined, and their relation considered; that we may keep in view the peculiar genius of the Language, and the connection which ought to prevail, and actually does so, between the Thoughts; as likewise the resemblance which several Letters of the Alphabet bear to each other, and which the Transcriber may more easily mistake than the Printer; and that these principles may be applied to the word from which the difficulty arises.

A sincere love for the Christian Religion is an essential qualification; that we may not study to find mistakes in passages *immediately relative to Faith*, but endeavour to convince the people of the excellence, the soundness, and the holiness of their religion, and to make them reverence the book which contains it.

Great self-diffidence is necessary, that such a Work may be carried on, as it ought to be, with fear and trembling; that a man may not lean to his own understanding, nor set up himself for an Oracle or Prophet; and, above all, that he may be very careful not to impose on the world by any falsehood or deceit.

Lastly, there should be *an absolutely disinterested mind*, that the Work may be undertaken only for the glory of being serviceable to Religion; a man is not to refuse the benefactions of his Prince, the assistance of the Great, or the subscriptions of the Curious; but these ought not to be the principal aim of a Work. If

Learning.

Learning gathers Laurels, sordid interest should not blast them.

In you, Sir, *no doubt*, are united all these qualifications. This is a fact, however, which I am going briefly to examine.

Are you furnished with good Manuscripts?

To enhance the excellence of the Copies you make use of, you begin with depreciating those from which our Bible was printed.

"The Mistakes, you say, (Dissertation, Vol. I. p. 247) were first introduced by late and faulty Manuscripts, &c" Now this is what you ought not to have said, because it is not true, as I shall make appear.

These Manuscripts were neither late nor faulty; for Cardinal *Ximenés*, whose Edition has been esteemed the most important in the Church, says expressly, that he had provided with great care and diligence, *CASTIGATISSIMA ex omni parte, VETUSTISSIMAQUE exemplaria pro archetypis, the most CORRECT and most ANTIENT copies to print from.* These words seem to embarrass you, and you slip over them very slightly in your Dissertation, Vol. II. p. 475. as if you had not attended to them, though, it must be confessed, they are very clear and very strong.

"Furnished by *Jews*, or by those who had been *Jews.*"

That is true; but the *Jews*, whom the Cardinal employed, were become *Christians* long before that undertaking, and were the most learned men of that nation. How can you venture to offer such a wretched reason as any proof? Do you not know it is owing to the *Jews*, that we are in possession of the Bible? That it is through their means this Book has been dispersed over the world? That they have always had the greatest veneration for it, and, by

a peculiar providence, have never dared to diminish from, or add a single word to it? And yet you will have it, that they have wantonly and wilfully contributed to corrupt it by furnishing imperfect Manuscripts from which to print it. This is contrary to common sense. All that the *Jews* have done has been, as the consequence of their blindness, to explain away the meaning of those passages, which too plainly speak against them, or in favour of *Christ*; and they would sooner denounce an anathema against any one, who should calculate *Daniel's Weeks*, than meddle with the Text, in which their own condemnation is so evidently pronounced.

Besides, how is it, that you do not perceive that this reproach on them shakes your whole Work? For in short, if the printed Text is corrupt, because Manuscripts furnished by *Jews* were made use of, what credit can you expect should be given to your pretended Corrections, since all the ancient Copies, by which you flatter yourself you shall improve our Text, come from them? And I challenge you to produce any ancient Manuscript, which was not written by a *Jew*.

But farther, you cannot deny that you have yourself collated many Manuscripts of *Jewish* extraction. Such are those which are called the * *Haphtaroth*, and such are the *Rolls*, which you think are exceeding beautiful; and which you make use of continually for correcting the printed Text. By what accident is it that the *Jews* of the fifteenth Century have furnished very imperfect Copies for printing the Bible, and the Libraries, three hundred years after, have supplied you with very excellent ones for correcting it? This does not seem easy to comprehend; but there

* These are Lessons appropriated for the use of the *Jewish* Synagogue.

is, however, a good reason for it; and, as you, without doubt, are well acquainted with it, I shall only mention it for the information of those, who may not be apprized of it.

There are now in *Europe*, perhaps, three times the number of Manuscripts that there were before the invention of printing. The reason is, that people then adhered, in simplicity of heart, to the Translations which the Church had adopted. The Text was printed from the best Manuscripts; and it was for a long time had in reverence: afterwards, when the *Hebrew* began to be studied, and people thought themselves very learned, because they barely knew how to read and construe it, the printed Text came under examination. But, as the principles of the Language were only superficially known, and the peculiar genius of it not attended to, every difficulty that presented itself was reckoned an error of the Press; Manuscripts were every where sought for to compare with the printed Text, and there were very few to be found; but,

Auri sacra fames—

As soon as it was known, that some advantage might be reaped from them, there appeared thousands of them. And as the Transcribers had the art of fimoaking them, and giving them an air of antiquity, they were looked upon with the most extraordinary veneration, and the Curious paid for them their weight in Gold. This was what the Transcriber wanted.

Such, Sir, are the greatest part of the Manuscripts by which you collate, and pretend to correct the printed Text. Base Children of Obscurity, that owe their existence to self-interest, their excellence to prejudice, and their splendor to imposture. Could

those who fabricated them ever have imagined, that such records would one day become the rivals—the rivals do I say? the Arbiters, the Comptrollers of the printed Text?

I say, *the greatest part*; for there are some of them truly respectable for their age: but, after having paid them the homage due to their antiquity, can one, ought one to regard them as unexceptionable Vouchers? Are they sufficiently correct? Are there no gross mistakes, blunders, &c. in them? In short, are they proper records to give law in the Church, and annihilate our Text? This is what I am about to examine, and I shall follow your reasonings as faithfully as I have traced your footsteps in the Libraries at *Paris*.

In the state of the Collation, 1767, you say, “The use of the thirty-seven *Hebrew* Manuscripts, and two *Samaritan*, preserved in the very magnificent Library of his most Christian Majesty, was granted me.—One of the oldest and best of these Royal Manuscripts, containing the *whole Bible*, has been examined, and the various readings extracted from it are numerous, and of great consequence.”

That sounds well; but I am not obliged to believe it upon your word; (indeed there is reason to mistrust you, as you will presently see) you should have given the number of this Manuscript, and then I might have justified your commendation of it. Mr. *Capperonier*, who is not only a learned Librarian, but a man of worth, has been so kind as to shew me these thirty-seven Manuscripts; but he could not tell me which it was you meant, though they are all very exactly numbered. Whether this omission of your's is owing to forgetfulness or design, I know not; all that I can affirm is, that besides the thirty-seven you mention, there are many others of which you take no notice.

You

You say there are three *Hebrew* Manuscripts in the Library of *St. Germain des Prés*. There are so; and I know likewise, that you had them at your lodging all the time you staid at *Paris* to collate them; and you told one of the Librarians, that one of them was a very good one. Why do not you make some mention of the variations that are found in them? You have your reasons, without doubt, for passing them over in silence; and I have mine for making them public. I will send you some of them by the next post.

You say, that, in the Library of *St. Génovése*, there is an *Hebrew* and a *Samaritan* Manuscript, which contain many useful variations. I have seen them both and examined them; and I know not why you conceal the wretched condition of the *Samaritan* Manuscript. Candour must oblige you to allow, that this Manuscript contains only some *fragments* of the Pentateuch, as it does not begin till the fifth verse of the fifth chapter of *Genesis*; that the writing of the first part is upon parchment; that a great many verses, and even some whole Chapters are wanting in it; and that, in many places, there are whole chapters written on common paper by another hand. What noble variations you would have found in the parts that are wanting! I have extracted some of those which occur in the fragments that remain, and you shall see them. In regard to the *Hebrew* Manuscript, all that can be said of it is, that it would be one third larger, if there were not a third omitted. Some of the omissions I shall mention in my next Letter.

The Libraries of the *Fathers of the Oratory of St. Victoire*, and of the *Minims*, have likewise been opened to you. "The Fathers of the Oratory have
" eight *Hebrew* and two *Samaritan* Manuscripts. One

“ of these, you say, is the Copy from which *Morinus* printed, and is the only *Samaritan* Manuscript, (out of sixteen now in *Europe*) which has yet been made proper use of.” Perhaps so.

The Libraries of *Ste Victoire* and the *Minims* have each only one *Hebrew* Manuscript; and as you say nothing of them, I am likewise silent.

In short, you send in search of Manuscripts as far as *China*. (Col. 1768.) “ Enquiries have also been made, you say, (Col. 1764.) in *America*, though hitherto without success, as to Manuscripts of proper antiquity.”

That your enquiries have been without success does not surprise me; for give me leave to tell you, that you did not go to work properly. You should have published an Advertisement in *America* and *China*, as early as the year 1750, in the form following,

THE REVEREND BENJAMIN KENNICOTT, ENGLISH DOCTOR OF DIVINITY, GIVES NOTICE, THAT HE HAS A MIND TO CORRECT THE PRINTED HEBREW TEXT: FOR THIS PURPOSE, HE IS IN WANT OF SOME ANCIENT MANUSCRIPTS; AND HE WILL LIBERALLY REWARD THOSE, WHO WILL SUPPLY HIM WITH THEM.

In ten years after, a good number of them, and of the most ancient too, would have been produced. There must be a reasonable time allowed to the Transcribers to write and disguise them.

But what astonishes me is, that you should say, “ yet I am told that some such *Hebrew* Manuscripts may possibly be found amongst the *Jews*, even in that quarter of the world.” Well, and suppose there should, would it any way forward your Work? Do you forget then, that one of your objections against Cardinal *Ximenés’s* Bible is, that it was printed from Manuscripts furnished by *Jews*, or those who had been *Jews*? And would you be tempted to take Manuscripts

manuscripts from their hands? Are the *Jews of America* honest men than those of *Spain*?

You mention also in your first Dissertation, p. 342, the Manuscript, No. 68, in the *Cambridge Library*, as a valuable piece, which contains some important variations. Your Subscribers may believe you on your bare word, if they please, but I shall not be so complaisant: as I have had extracts from it sent me by a person of credit, whose fidelity I should rely on, rather than on what you say, I shall analyse it, and shew what value ought to be set upon it. I shall not forget to take some notice likewise of the Manuscripts, and *Samaritan Text* of the *Polyglott*, by which you pretend to correct the printed *Hebrew Text*.

As this detail will be somewhat long, and would exceed the bounds of a common Letter, I design to finish the present with two reflections on your undertaking; and though they may be rather disagreeable to you, I cannot refrain from publishing them.

First. Accuracy ought to be the basis of your Work; for as soon as it is perceived that you are guilty of mistakes, you will be read with disgust, or, at least, with suspicion. The learned, who look for information in a book so interesting as your's, will expect to be certain of not having one word imposed upon them for another. If you are convinced of this truth, as I question not but you are, why do you present us with such falsehoods, as the following are a specimen of?

In your first Dissertation, (p. 1.) you say, that the printed Text has,

[printed text,
2 Sam. V. 1. אַנְכֵנו; which is not true; for it is אֲנַחְנו in the
Page 227.

1 Chron. XI. 42. הֲרֹאוּבֵנו, the same, - - - הֲרֹאוּבֵנִי
Page 427.

Deut. XXXIII. 2. מִיָּמֵינוּ, the same, - - - מִיָּמֵינוּ

1 Chron. II. 18. יִרְעוּת, the same, - - - יִרְעוּת

And

And in the next page you have twice together put יריעות, when it is יריעות.

Is it then on purpose to make the printed Text ridiculous, that you invent such barbarous words, as are not of any Language? You will tell me, perhaps, that they are Errors of the Press; but I have convincing proofs that they are not, that they are Errors of your own making. First, In regard to the feminine word מימינה, which is found in the *Samaritan Version*, and which you maintain (Dissert. I. p. 430.) to be in the *masculine* מימינו, as in the *Hebrew* printed Text. Secondly, Because you tell us in your second Dissertation, p. 186, that you have found a Manuscript, which Deut. v. 18. reads לא תנוף, where the printed Text is ולא תנוף. I make no doubt that your *Manuscript* has such blunders in it; but I challenge you to shew any *Edition*, where the word תנוף, and the others above-mentioned are to be found. Thirdly, Because in your first Dissertation, p. 428, you boldly assert, that in Habac. iii. 3. the printed Text has פארן כסה, when it is פארן סלה כסה. Indeed, Sir, such inadvertencies reflect no honour on your Work. I omit others, and pass on to the second reflection.

We have in *France* a man respectable for his virtues, and for his age, Father *Houbigant*, of the *Ora- tory*. He engaged in a Work of the same nature as yours. In vain, after forty years labour, did four large Volumes in folio, of a *Hebrew Bible*, re-printed at his own expence, and loaded with his pretended Corrections, serve to force open for him the Gates of the Temple of Fame, and seem to conduct him to immortality. His Glory was of short duration; for as he had not made any use or necessary application of the peculiar genius of the *Hebrew Language*, and had never tried his corrections, but by his own opinion, the true Hebraist soon saw, that the Work was
but

but superficial, naturally inferred that the mistakes it announced were mere chimeras, and abided by the printed Text. Let us reason now upon this last fact.

Do you think, that you understand *Hebrew* better than Father *Houbigant*? I question it: and though you treat him as a very * enterprising man, who had better not have published some Criticisms, which seem to you too bold; though Dr *Hunt*, the applauder of your labours, exhausts himself in Compliments, to raise you to the skies; though you decorate your state of Collations with the most respectable names in *Europe*, and which I esteem, perhaps, more sincerely than you do; though, lastly, you have forced the voice of Fame to transmit your name to the world's end; yet I am not to be deceived by appearances, I do not suffer myself to be misled by the acclamations of a credulous vulgar, or dazzled by the glare of affected knowledge; I am convinced, that you know indeed how to read *Hebrew*, but that you have not a thorough knowledge of the principles and genius of that Language.

You will tell me, without doubt, that the comparison I make between you and Father *Houbigant* is not just, because you consult twenty times as many Manuscripts as he does; and that is true: but what is the consequence of it? Why, *twenty times as much* confusion in the *Hebrew* Language. There are three of you, who have already openly attacked the printed *Hebrew* Text, and I am persuaded that you three have already found more than twenty thousand Corruptions. Should a fourth arise, equally enterprising, there will not remain a single word in the *Hebrew* Bible, for the integrity of which one may safely vouch.

* Differt Vol. II. p. 488.

Consider then the consequences of your undertaking ; it can never gain you any credit ; and nothing will be the result, but a mishapen work, no way conformable to the rules of sound criticism, totally useless, and calculated rather to dazzle by a vain shew of pretended corrections, than to instruct by solid reasonings. Take my advice, therefore, and change your subject ; if you wish to establish an honourable character. Imitate the great men of your own country, and distinguish yourself like *Newton*, *Pope*, *Milton*, &c. by some noble Work, in which the superiority of your Genius may be displayed. Then I will do justice to your merit ; and should I spend whole nights with you, as with melancholy *Young*, in the midst of tombs and spectres, I shall honour your abilities, and have a sincere pleasure in subscribing myself,

S I R,

Your's, &c.

L E T T E R II,

I Promised, Sir, that you should hear from me again the first opportunity, and I am as good as my word. Not to take up your time in unnecessary discourse, I shall enter directly on the business I proposed, which was to shew the value of the Manuscripts you make use of. As you say nothing of those you saw in the King's Library, except that *the most ancient and valuable of them* contains a great number of variations of the utmost consequence, and I know not which this Manuscript is, I am obliged to imitate your silence. But I shall not be so complaisant in regard to some others; and though you have not thought proper to take any notice of the Variations which are found in them, I think myself obliged to exhibit a small specimen of them for you, to shew your Subscribers, and the whole *Christian* world, what dependence they ought to have on your Labours, and on the Materials you * employ. Let us first view the three Manuscripts of *S. Germain des Prés*.

* In the following extracts, which are not the hundredth part of what might be produced, the readings of the Column on the *left hand*, are those which are in the Text of *Vander Hooght's* Edition; the Column on the *right hand* contains the different readings in the Text of the *Manuscripts*. I have put the meaning of the term or phrase in *English* on the side of the *Hebrew*, that such Readers as are not conversant in the *Hebrew* Language may understand them, and see the difference between them.

The

The Manuscript, No. 1, contains the *Pentateuch*, the * *Megilloth*, and *Haphtaroth*. You take it to have been written in the thirteenth Century; and possibly it was. It is your interest to give an ancient date to the Manuscripts you make use of; but if I had been Librarian, I should never have suffered you to put the date to my Manuscripts. Besides that it is assuming a degree of knowledge and pre-eminence which does not become any one, I am persuaded your dates are entirely arbitrary, as I shall presently prove.

MANUSCRIPT, No. 1.

As there are one or two leaves at the beginning of the *Pentateuch*, which are not legible, I have extracted some variations out of a great number, which are found in the *Haphtaroth*.

H A P H T A R A H, page 150.

JUDGES, CHAP. IV.

PRINTED TEXT.	MANUSCRIPT.
v. 4. הִיא <i>she</i> .	4. וְהִיא <i>and she</i> .
20. אִם אִישׁ יָבֹא <i>if any one come.</i>	20. אִם יָבֹא <i>if he come.</i>
23. כְּנָעַן (proper name)	written on a rasure.

CHAPTER V.

v. 1. דְּבוֹרָה (proper name)	v. 1. דְּבוֹרָהּ <i>Deborahath</i> .
3. מְלָכִים <i>Kings</i> .	The ם final is very small, and has been added by another Writer.
18. חָרַף <i>hazarded</i> .	Was originally חָרַב, which signifies <i>a sword</i> , and since altered by another hand.
30. לְרֹאשׁ גִּבּוֹר <i>to every man</i> .	The word לְרֹאשׁ <i>to every</i> , is omitted.

* That is the Song of Songs, Ruth, the Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther, to which the *Jews* give that name.

I KINGS, CHAP. XVIII.

PRINTED TEXT.	MANUSCRIPT.
v. 1. הִיָּה <i>he was</i> (came)	v. 1. הִתָּה <i>she was</i> (came)
2. אַחָאב <i>Abab</i> (proper name)	2. אַחָאב has no meaning written twice.
4. חֲמִשִּׁים <i>fifty</i> .	
6. וַעֲבָדֵהוּ הֵלֵךְ } <i>and Obdiah</i> בִּדְרֶךְ אֲחֵר לְבָדּוֹ } <i>went another</i> } <i>way by himself.</i>	Omitted.
11. אַתָּה אָמַר לְךָ <i>thou sayest, go.</i>	11. אַתָּה לְךָ אָמַר <i>thou go, sayest go.</i>
12. אֲשֶׁר לֹא אֲדַע <i>whither I know not.</i>	12. אֲשֶׁר אֲדַע, <i>whither I know.</i>
13. כַּהֲרֹג <i>when he slew.</i>	13. בַּהֲכָרִית means the same.
16. אַחָאב <i>Abab</i> (proper name)	Omitted.
17. זֶה <i>he.</i>	
19. הָאֵשֶׁרָה <i>of the grove.</i>	19. הָאֲשׁוּרָה <i>Affyria.</i>
20. בָּנֵי <i>the children.</i>	20. גְּבוּל <i>border.</i>
21. וְאַם הַבַּעַל } <i>but if Baal, follow</i> לְכוּ אַחֲרָיו } <i>him.</i>	Omitted.
24. וַיַּעַן <i>and he answered.</i>	24. וַיַּעֲנוּ <i>and they answered.</i>

The Manuscript, No. 2, which you pretend was written in the twelfth * Century, begins with *Joshua*, &c. Here are some of the Variations.

JOSHUA, CHAP. I.

PRINTED TEXT.	MANUSCRIPT.
v. 11. בְּעֵינִי <i>for within</i> (three days).	v. 11. מִבְּעֵינִי has no meaning.
15. אֲשֶׁר יְהוָה <i>which the Lord.</i>	15. אֲשֶׁר יְרוּשְׁתְּכֶם יְהוָה <i>that you possess the Lord.</i>
Id. אֹתָהּ <i>it.</i>	Omitted.
16. כָּל <i>all.</i>	16. כָּל <i>according to all.</i>
Id. תִּשְׁלַחֵנוּ <i>thou sendest us.</i>	Id. תִּשְׁלַחֵנוּ not Hebrew.

* This proves how arbitrary the dates are, which the Doctor gives to his Manuscripts. For I do not believe there is difference enough between the writing of the twelfth and thirteenth Century to determine the Manuscript, No. 2, to be one hundred years older than No. 1.

JOSHUA,

JOSHUA, CHAP. II.

PRINTED TEXT.

- V. 2. הנה *behold.*
9. אימתכם *your terror.*

10. כי *for.*
12. השבעו נא } *swear now to*
לי ביהוה } *me by the Lord.*
17. ויאמרו אליה } *and they said*
unto her.

MANUSCRIPT.

Omitted

Before this word there is added איתם, which is of no language.

10. כִּי of no Language.
12. השמעו נא } *hear me now*
לי ביהוה } *by the Lord.*
17. ויאמרו להם } *and they said*
unto them. Instead of the word להם they have put אליהם in the margin, which does not mend the sense.

CHAP. III.

- V. 1. וילכו שם } *and they lodged*
there.
3. כראתכם } *when you shall*
see.
16. הרחק מאד } *very far.*

1. וילכו שם } *and they went*
there.
3. כראתכם } *they have put a*
ב instead of a כ.
16. הרחק מאד } *very is omitted.*

CHAP. IV.

- V. 3. אשר תלינו בו } *where you*
shall lodge.
8. ויעבדום } *and carried*
them.

3. אשר תלינו בו } *where*
you shall lodge upon it.
8. ויעבדום } *it means. They*
have served them; but as the
is placed after ב, the whole
word has no meaning.

CHAP. V.

- V. 6. לבלתי הראותם } *that he*
את הארץ אשר } *would*
נשבע יהוה } *not shew*
which } *them the*
the Lord } *land*
swore. } *which*
the Lord } *the Lord*
swore. }

Omitted.

10. בארבעה } *on the four-*
עשר יום } *teenth day.*

10. בראשון בארבעה } *in the*
עשר יום } *first,*
} *on the*
} *four-*
} *teenth*
} *day.*

11. הפסח

11. הפסח *the passover*.

| הפסח not Hebrew

13. והנה *and behold*.

The נה was originally *three*
 Letters, which are erased in
 such a manner, that one can-
 not distinguish what sort of
 Letters they were before.

The Manuscript, No. 3, contains the *Pentateuch*,
 the *Megilloth*, and *Haphtharoth*. The following are
 some of the Variations.

GENESIS, CHAP. I.

PRINTED TEXT.

MANUSCRIPT.

v. 27. ונקבה *and female* - - - ונקיבה not Hebrew.

CHAP. II.

v. 3. מכל *of every*

| Omitted

8. גן בעדן *a garden in Eden*8. גם בעדן also *in Eden*.19. חית *beast*

חית not Hebrew

וכל אשר יקרא לו
whatsoever he called them

| Omitted

20. לא מצא *was not found*20. לו מצא *to him was found*

CHAP. III.

v. 10. ואחבא *and I hid myself*

| ואיחבא not Hebrew

16. אישך *thy husband*16. אישך *thy fire*19. בזעת *in the sweat*

| בזיעת not Hebrew

CHAP. IV.

v. 7. אם *if*

| written twice

v. 25. עוד *again*

| omitted

The dates which are placed at the end of this Manu-
 script are very singular. It is dated by two different
 persons; one says, that he wrote and finished it on
Thursday, the 4th of the Month *Ab* (July), the * 5063
 year of the Creation of the World.

יום ה' באב שנת חמשת אלפים
 ושישים לבריאת עולם &c.

* As this date differs three years from that contained in the
Hebrew characters, Candour obliges us to acknowledge, that
 unless the word שלישי be omitted by an error of the Press, the
 ingenious Author's Objection in this instance is unsupported,
 as the present must have been made near three years *after* the
 Manuscript was finished, instead of three months *before*, as he
 supposes.

D

And

And the other says, that his mother made him a present of the said Manuscript, on *Monday*, the first of the month *Jer* (April), the 5063 year of the Creation, &c.

היום יום ברח אייר שנת ה אלפים וסג
לבריה קבלתי מאמי זה החומש במותנה &c.

This last date, in which the person says, that his mother made him a present of it, is three months prior to the other. Two things however must be observed; the first, that instead of ס (60) he had put a ש (300), which he erased to shew that it was a mistake; the second, that you have taken no notice of this last date: but why, I know not.

I believe that the short detail I have given of Variations in the three Manuscripts above mentioned, is sufficient to enable any one, however little skilled in *Hebrew*, to ascertain their value. If there still remain any scruple on that head, I declare it as a fact, and am ready to prove, that the above recited are not the *hundredth* part of the mistakes and blunders to be found in them.

Let us proceed to the Manuscripts of *St^e Genevieve*. There are two of them, *one Samaritan and one Hebrew*. I promised you some of the Variations in the *Samaritan*. Here they are.

GENESIS, CHAP. V.

PRINTED HEBREW TEXT.	SAMARITAN MANUSCRIPT
v. 18. ומאת שנה <i>and an hundred years</i>	Omitted, so v. 35.
28. שנים } <i>one hundred</i> ושמונים } <i>eighty-</i> ומאת שנה } <i>two years</i>	v. 28. שלשה } <i>fifty - three</i> וחמשים } <i>years</i> שנה }

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

PRINTED HEBREW TEXT.

v. 19. ומכל החי { *and of every*
 מכל בשר { *living thing*
 of all flesh

Id. זכר ונקבה { *they shall be*
 יהיו { *male and fe-*
 male

20. מהעוף { *of fowl*

מכל רמש { *of every*
 האדמה { *creeping*
 thing of the
 earth

SAMARITAN MANUSCRIPT.

v. 19. ומכל החיה { *and of e-*
 ומכל בשר { *very ani-*
 mal, and
 of all flesh

Id. זכר ונקבה { *male and fe-*
 ויהי כן { *male, and it*
 was so

20. העוף { *the fowl*

מכל אשר { *of every*
 רמש האדמה { *thing which*
 creepeth of
 the earth

CHAP. VII.

v. 3. השמים { *of the air*

v. 3. השמים הטהור { *the air,*
 the pure

EXODUS, CHAP. XX.

v. 5. שלשים { *the third genera-*
 tion

שלשים { *the meaning of*
 this word is Princes, Dukes, or
 Captains. See Ezek. xxiii. 15.
 1 Chron. xi. 2. and xii. 18.

10. לא תעשה { *thou shalt not*
 make

10. לא תעשה בו { *the word*
 בו is added here as in Deut.
 v. 14.

11. אשר { *which is*

This word is omitted in the
 Text, and put in the margin by
 another hand.

DEUT. CHAP. V.

v. 8. ממעל { *above*

9. לא תשתחוה להם { *thou*
 shalt not worship them.

v. 8. ממעל { *from above*

לא תשתחוי להם { *The*
 letter ' improperly put for ה

I should have extracted more of them, and some even more extraordinary, if the greatest part of the Leaves and Chapters of this Manuscript were not transposed in such a manner as to make it exceeding troublesome to collate it. I should likewise have given a specimen of the Variations of the proper names, if the chief of them had not been the same as those

of the *Samaritan Pentateuch*, the *London Polyglott*, and the *Samaritan Manuscript of Morinus*. But my time is not, like yours, *the time of the Public* *; it is still my own, and I should regret employing so much of it as I have done in the foregoing Extracts, did it not serve to determine the value of your materials.

In regard to the *Hebrew Manuscript*, I have only selected the omissions in the first nine Chapters of *Genesis*, amongst which there is a very curious addition.

G E N E S I S.

PRINTED TEXT.

I. 26. אלהים *God*

II. 2. וישבת ביום
השביעי מכל
מלאכתו אשר עשה

III. 22. האדם *the man*
23. לעבד *to till*
24. עץ *the tree*

IV. 7. חטאת *sin*

{ and he
rested the
seventh
day from
all his
work
which he
had made }

Omitted in the Manuscript.

In the Manuscript
אתה חטאת *thee, or thou, sin.*
A very curious addition !

* Some well grounded Criticisms having appeared against Dr. Kennicott, instead of answering them, he said, that *his time was become the time of the Public*, and by that singular plea excused himself from replying to the objections that had been made against him. See his Letter inserted in *the Library, or moral and critical Magazine for August, 1761*, in answer to an anonymous Letter addressed to him in the same *Magazine* for the month of *July*, and the *Postscript* of his pretended answer to a Letter from Dr. Rutherford, of Cambridge.

PRINTED TEXT.

IV. 22. קין (proper name)

V. 26. ושבע מאות שנה *and*
*seven hundred years*VII. 13 נשי *wives*

VIII. 7. The whole verse

IX. 4. דמו *the blood thereof*5. { האדם *of man*{ מיד *at the hand*11. עוד מכול *any more a*
flood

Omitted in the Manuscript

Let us now examine that valuable piece, that famous Manuscript, No. 68, in the public Library at Cambridge, in which are to be found some considerable Variations.

You say (in your first Dissertation, p. 342) that it was written by *Jacob Levi*, and dated in these words,

הַתּוֹרָה לִיצִירָה. If there were only these two words, there would not be any difficulty, and it would be the year 610; because, as you ought to know, it is only the Letters marked with an acute accent, which are to be reckoned. But there follows immediately in the Manuscript לְבִנּוֹן בֵּית הַבְּחִירָה *of the building of the temple*. *Jacob Levi* should indeed have said whether it was the first, second, or third; and you, on seeing these last words, ought to have made the proper calculation; it would have saved me the trouble of doing it.

The first Temple built by *Solomon* for the Glory of the Lord was finished, and dedicated in the year of the World 2999, and before the Incarnation 1001 years. Now if the Manuscript was written 610 years after the building of the first Temple, it would be in the year 1771, 2162 years old.

The second Temple was built after the return from the Captivity, and dedicated in the year of the world 3489, 511 years before *Christ*. So that if the Manu-

script bears date 610 years after that building, it is now 1672 years old.

If it speaks of the third Temple, built by *Herod*, and finished in 3987, the age of it at this time is 1174, and consequently it is of the sixth Century. If the date be true, I acknowledge that it is one of the most ancient Manuscripts in *Europe*, but, whether it is the better for that, is a question which I shall now discuss as methodically as I am able.

First, The first Variations that I shall set down are in a number of words which are of no Language.

EXAMPLES.

PRINTED TEXT.	MANUSCRIPT.
Gen. XXX. 22. אלהיה אלהיה <i>God (hearkened) to her.</i>	Of two words they have made only one, which is of no language.
Lev. XXVII. 11. ל יהוה <i>to the Lord</i>	להוה
Deut. I. 25. ויוורדו <i>and brought them</i>	וורדו
Josh. XVI. 10. הכנעני <i>the Canaanites</i>	הנעני
Id. XXIV. 11. האמורי <i>the Amorites</i>	יהאמורי
Judg. IX. 1. לאמר <i>saying</i>	לאמור

Secondly, The following are another set of various readings, which, though they are *Hebrew Words*, make no sense in the passages where they stand.

EXAMPLES.

PRINTED TEXT.	MANUSCRIPT.
Exod. XXXII. 26. אלי <i>to him</i>	26. אלי <i>to me</i>
Lev. IV. 35. אתם <i>them</i>	35. אתה <i>thou</i>
Num. XXI. 7. ויאמרו <i>and they said</i>	7. ויאמר <i>and he said</i>
Deut. XXI. 2. הערים <i>the cities</i>	2. העיר <i>the city</i>
Joshua, V. 14. לא <i>not</i>	14. לו <i>to him</i>

Judges

Judges IX. 51. ויעלו <i>and they went up</i>	51. ויעל <i>and he went up</i>
1 Sam. XVI. 13. רוח יהוה <i>the spirit of the Lord.</i>	13. רוח אליהם <i>the spirit to them</i>

Thirdly, It is to be observed that there are in the *Hebrew Alphabet* five Letters, which in shape greatly resemble five others.

ב Beth	ג Gimel	ד Daleth	ה He	מ Mem
and כ Caph	and נ Nun	and ר Resch	and ח Heth	and ס Sa- mech

There are a great number of Manuscripts, where mistakes occur in these five Letters, owing either to their being badly cut, or to the Manuscripts we have at present, being for the most part (as I suspect) written by *Boys*, or others, who *perhaps* were able to read *Hebrew*, but did not know enough of it to understand what they copied. However *ancient* your Manuscript may be, it is likewise faulty in that particular.

EXAMPLES.

PRINTED TEXT.	MANUSCRIPT.
1 Sam. XXV. 16. רעמה <i>a wall</i>	16. רמה <i>a noise or tumult.</i> See 1 King. i. 14. and Prov. xx. 1, &c.
2 Id. XXI. 18. בגב <i>in Gob</i>	18. בנב <i>in Nob</i>
1 Kings III. 6. כיום הזה <i>as this day</i>	6. ביום הזה <i>in this day</i>
Id. XVII. 20. אשר אני } <i>with whom</i>	Instead of the verb <i>sojourn</i> , he puts מתגורר with a ד at the end, a word which has no meaning.
מתגורר עמה } <i>I so-journ.</i>	
Prov. VI. 3. התרפסו <i>kumble yourselves</i>	התרפס means nothing, except it had a ' inserted after the letter פ, and then it would signify <i>the images</i> . See Gen. xxxi. 19, &c.

I am persuaded, that in collating this Manuscript one might produce near 1400 Variations of the three sorts of which I have been speaking.

Fourthly, The following are words which were not sense in the original writing, but have been corrected and made conformable to the printed Text by another hand.

EXAMPLES.

PRINTED TEXT,	MANUSCRIPT.
Gen. XXXVIII. 28. בלרתה <i>when she travailed</i>	בלרתה in the
Exod. II. 16. להשקות <i>to water</i>	cover or lid
Lev. VI. 13. תמיד <i>always</i>	להשחות of no Language תמים <i>perfect</i>

There are about 234 Corrections of this Sort.

Fifthly, The next I shall mention are some curious additions made by the Transcriber himself. It is pity that the greatest part of them are not sense.

EXAMPLES.

PRINTED TEXT.	MANUSCRIPT.
Gen. II. 9. הגן <i>of the garden</i>	9. הגן ומשם <i>of the garden, and from thence.</i>
XXXVII. 14. ויאמר לו לך <i>and he said to him, go</i>	14. וילך יוסף האיש נס ויאמר לו לך <i>and Joseph went, the man fled, and he said to him, go</i>
Exod. XVIII. 24. משה <i>Moses</i>	24. מה משה <i>what Moses</i>
XXV. 1. וידבר יהוה אל משה <i>and the Lord spake unto Moses</i>	1. וידבר יהוה אל יהוה משה <i>and the Lord spake unto the Lord Moses</i>
Num. XI. 1. רע באזני יהוה <i>it displeased the ears of the Lord</i>	1. רע בעיני באזני יהוה <i>it displeased the eyes, the ears of the Lord</i>

Deut.

Deut. II. 31.	את סיחון ואת ארצו	} Sibon and his land	31.	את סיחון לקראתנו הוא ואת ארצו	} Sibon to meet us and his land
---------------	----------------------	-------------------------------	-----	----------------------------------	---

There are about 330 such Additions in the Manuscript.

There are likewise above 300 rasures. I shall mention only two of them by way of example.

PRINTED TEXT.	MANUSCRIPT.
Gen. II. 22. הצלע <i>the rib</i>	The צ is upon a rasure
VI. 21. לך ולחם <i>for thee and for them</i>	Between these two words there are three or four Letters erased.

Seventhly, There are also more than 630 Omissions, by which the sense of the places is, for the most part, destroyed, and among them eleven whole verses are omitted. Two of them only shall be mentioned for example.

Gen. I. 26. הרמש <i>creeping thing</i>	} Omitted in the Manuscript
III. 15. זרעך ובין <i>thy seed and between</i>	

Eighthly, The doubtful words or letters, to the number of about 450, also supply you with abundant matter for enlarging the Collations, and exercising your critical acumen.

Ninthly, There are likewise about 120 repetitions, and among them three whole verses, viz. the twelfth verse of the thirty-first chapter of Genesis; the seventeenth verse of the sixth chapter of Exodus, and the tenth verse of the eleventh chapter of Isaiah. Some of the repetitions are these that follow.

PRINTED

PRINTED TEXT.

Gen. XIII. 2. ואברם Abram

XVII. 8. מגריך את כל ארץ { where thou art a
stranger. All the landXXVIII. 5. אל לבן בן בתואל } unto Laban son of
Bethuel the Sy-
הארמי אחי רבקה } rian the brother
אם יעקב ועשו } of Rebekah, Ja-
cob's and Esau's
mother } written twice
over in the
Manuscript

Tenthly, There are some transpositions also, which give no favourable idea of the Transcriber's knowledge, * as witness the word ציִאֲרוֹן, which is not of any Language.

EXAMPLES.

JEREMIAH, CHAP. XLVI.

PRINTED TEXT.

V. 10. לֵאדֹנִי יְהוָה to the Lord
Jehovah

MANUSCRIPT,

10. לִיהוָה לֵאדֹנִי, to Jehovah,
to the Lord

JUDGES, CHAP. X.

V' 6. ואת אלהי צידון ואת אלהי מואב	{ and the Gods of Zi- don and the Gods of Moab	6. ואת אלהי מואב ואת אלהי ציִאֲרוֹן צידון	{ and the Gods of Moab, and the Gods of (Tfia- don) Zi- don
---------------------------------------	--	---	---

In short, if the initial or final letters are greater or less than the others ; if they are illuminated, or any

* This does not seem to be accurate in the original *French*, the word ציִאֲרוֹן, Jud. x. 6. is not an Instance of *Transposition* but of *Insertion* and *Barbarism*.

way decorated with pictures; if a word or sentence is left unpointed; if a line is filled up with some of the initial letters of the line following, or the vacancy supplied by a wider letter than usual; if a word is abridged, or the last letter placed above for want of room, and the like, you smile with approbation on the Manuscript, sigh contemptuously over the printed Text, and deluge us with a torrent of reasonings as groundless as they are impertinent.

The Collation of this Manuscript supplies you with about 12000 various readings; but there are not 4500, even including your futile remarks on the particulars just mentioned, and the marginal Corrections, which the Transcriber has taken into the Text; the rest which you reckon as Variations I can prove to be none at all. I will here subjoin some of them for the satisfaction of the Curious.

E X A M P L E S.

PRINTED TEXT.		MANUSCRIPT.	
Judges XVI. 24.	אויבינו	Our Enemies	איבינו
1 Sam. IV. 3.	איבינו		איביני
Levit. VI. 13.	האפה	An Epha	האיפה
Ezek. XLV. 13.	האיפה		האפה
2 Kings XXIV. 13.	אוצרות	Treasures	אצרות
1 Chron. XXVII. 25.	אצרות		אוצרות
Num. {	IV. 5. ארן	ark	ארון
	X. 33. ארון		ארן

These pretended Variations are exactly of the same importance, as the difference of spelling would be in the

the following words of the *French* Language, in a printed Copy, and a Manuscript alternately.

E X A M P L E S.

PRINTED COPY.		MANUSCRIPT.
Nôtre	_____	noſtre
Noſtre	_____	nôtre
Hôpital	_____	Hôſpital
Hôſpital	_____	Hôpital
Vôtre	_____	voſtre
Voſtre	_____	vôtre
Sol	_____	fou
Sou	_____	Sol
Col	_____	Cou
Cou	_____	col

Farther, if I have enlarged more on the Manuscript, No. 68, in the *Cambridge* Library, than on any other, it is with a view to enable the learned men of that Univerſity to examine my Extracts, I beg of them, with all humility, to ſatisfy themſelves of the truth of what I aſſert; and, if they will give themſelves the trouble to examine this Manuscript, as well as the others which you take to be ſo ancient and valuable, I hope they will agree with me that they are not of ſufficient authority whereby to correct the printed Text.

This detail, Sir, is tedious to you without doubt, and I would gladly have ſaved you the trouble of it, but you have obliged me to make it. Give me only a ſhort audience on the *Samaritan* Text of the Polyglott, by which you pretend to correct the printed Text, and I have done.

I have had the patience to collate *all Genesis*, and have there found, first, about seven hundred various readings, some of which are *no sense*, and others are of *no Language*. The following are a specimen.

E X A M P L E S.

PRINTED HEBREW TEXT. SAMARITAN TEXT OF THE
POLYGLOTT.

G E N E S I S.

III. 13. השיאני <i>beguiled me</i>	13. השיני it might be Hebrew, but it is not decent to explain it. See שין	The reading is the same in the Manuscript of Morinus
21. כתנות <i>coats</i>	כיתנות not Hebrew	
22. טוב <i>good</i>	שור <i>rank</i> . See Exod. xxviii. 17.	
VII. 12. והי הגשם <i>and the rain was</i>	יהי הגשם instead of the word יהי it is put which is not of any Language, and in the seventeenth verse יהי instead of ויהי	
VIII. 13. בראשון <i>in the first</i>	בראישון bad Hebrew	
22. וחרף <i>and winter</i>	והרף has no meaning (So XVII. 1.) והני <i>and alas</i>	The same in Morinus
XII. 2. והיה <i>and shall be</i>	ואתי <i>me or with me</i>	
11. את <i>thou</i>	ואתך יחי instead of ואתך, they have put ואתך which is not of any Language	
12. ואתך יחי <i>and they will save thee alive</i>		

XIII. 6.

PRINTED HEBREW TEXT.	SAMARITAN TEXT OF THE POLYGLOTT.
XIII. 6. יחרו <i>together</i>	יחרו <i>they shall be burnt.</i> See Ezek. xxiv. 10.
XVI. 8. מזה אי <i>from whence</i>	8. אי מזה <i>alas</i> } The same in Morinus from hence
12. פרא <i>wild</i>	12. פרי <i>fruit</i> }
XIX. 29. ההפכה <i>of the over-throw</i>	ההפכה has no meaning
XX. 13. נבוא <i>we shall come</i>	נבהא Idem
16. לך <i>to thee</i>	לך Idem
XXI. 17. מה לך <i>what aileth thee?</i>	מליך Idem
XXII. 2. יחידך <i>thine only</i>	יחידאך Idem
XXII. 16. יחידך <i>thine only</i>	Instead of the word in the Hebrew Text, he puts יחידאך, which has no meaning, and adds after it מומני <i>from me</i> , which is a very curious addition.
24. ואת מענה <i>and Maacab</i>	
XXIII. 5. לאמר לו <i>saying to him</i>	24. האת מענה <i>the sign Maacab</i>
18. באי <i>who went in</i>	5. לאמר לא <i>saying not</i>
XXIV. 17. הגמאיני <i>let me drink</i>	18. בעי <i>in the tomb.</i> See Job xxx. 24. If. xvii. 1, &c.
21. משתאה <i>wondering</i>	17. הגמני not Hebrew
XXV. 23. בבטן <i>in thy womb</i>	21. משתה <i>a feast.</i> See Gen. xix. 3.
30. הלעיטני <i>let me eat</i>	23. בבטני <i>in thy wombs (the wombs of Rebecca)</i>
34. הבברה <i>the birth-right</i>	העלטני not Hebrew
XXVII. 19. שבה <i>fit</i>	הבכה Idem
31. ויעש <i>and dressed</i>	19. שבע <i>seven (or full)</i>
	ויעס has no meaning

Secondly, What is very remarkable, I have met with two Rabbinical words; viz. Gen. xv. 10. בתור for בתוך, and xxi. 20. רבה for רבי; and one Chaldee word, xvi. 16. את for ית

Thirdly, There are about 95 proper names of persons and places which never existed, and of which no Trans-

Translation of the Bible makes any mention. Some of them are as follows.

E X A M P L E S.

G E N E S I S.

PRINTED HEBREW TEXT.	SAMARITAN TEXT OF THE POLYGLOTT
X. 2. מֹשֶׁךְ	2. מוֹשֹׁךְ
4. אֱלִישָׁה	4. אֱלִישָׁה
10. כִּלְנָה	10. כִּלְנָה
13. לֹדִים	13. לֹדִים
23. { עוֹץ חֹל }	23. { חוֹץ חֹל }
XI. 17. פֶּלֶג	17. פֶּבֶג
29. 2d. אֲבָרָם	29. אֲרָרָם
XIII. 3. 2d. בֵּית-אֵל	3. בֵּת-אֵל
Note, It is to be observed, that this proper name consists of two words, which signify <i>the house</i> <i>of God</i>	Note, This means <i>the daughter</i> <i>of God</i>
8. אֲבָרָם	8. אֲבָרָם (see above)
XIV. 6. פֶּאֶרֶן	6. פֶּרָאן (so Morinus)
24. עֶנֶר	24. עֶנֶר
XXV. 3. לְמוֹשֶׁה	3. לְמֹשֶׁה
XXXVI. 6. יַעֲקֹב	6. יַעֲקֹב
27. זֶעֶן	27. זֶעֶן
XLII. 36. בְּנִימָן	36. בְּנִימָן So ch. xliii. 14, 15, 16, 29, and 34. Ch. xliv. 12. Ch. xlv. 12, and 14, twice. Ch. xlv. 19. and Ch. xlix. 27.
XLVI. 13. פֹּהַ	13. פֹּאחַ
21. אֲחִי	21. אֲחִים

But this is not all, for I have compared it with the Manuscript of *Morinus*, which I had in my possession only two hours, and I discovered a great likeness between them in regard to the various readings, and the proper names.

Let us now say a few words as to the dates of your Manuscripts. First, I maintain that the greatest part of the dates affixed to them are false. As most of these

these Copies are posterior to printing, the *Jews* who manufactured them, and who lay it down as a law to cheat *Christians*, made no scruple of giving their work an antiquity of three, four, five, or six hundred years. You allow this yourself in a passage you quote (*Dissert. I. p. 311.*) in regard to a Manuscript which was exposed to sale at *Amsterdam* in the last Century. "It had (say you) an inscription and "date declaring it to have been written about three "hundred years before *Christ*, notwithstanding it was "full of the *Masoretic Minutiae* in the margin." Your reflection on this Manuscript is just, and it may with equal propriety be applied to the others. Depend upon it, that though their dates may not exhibit such a palpable contradiction, they are not less counterfeit; and that a Transcriber who considers his own interest, had rather secure to himself fifty guineas by ascribing an antiquity of 500 years only to the Manuscript he is fabricating, than run the risque of losing all by foolishly giving it a date of twenty ages.

Secondly, Most of the Manuscripts which are not dated have the *Masoretic Notes* in the Margin under the figure of *bears*, *dogs*, and other *animals* of the most extraordinary kind, and you esteem them as the best and most ancient. You may be right too in that respect; but why then do you endeavour, *Dissert. I. p. 294*, to depreciate the Edition of *Athias*, and make *Leusden* ridiculous, who declares that he printed from the most ancient and most correct Manuscripts, *antiquissimis*, & *accuratissimis*, from those which had the great *Masora* in the Margin under the forms of *bears*, *dogs*, and other animals? Do you not perceive then how you contradict yourself? Perhaps you may imagine, that those you make use of are better, because instead of *bears*, *dogs*, &c. they have figures of *Adam*, *Eve*, the *Devil*, and all sorts of *amphibious animals*.

animals. Be not deceived: these kinds of ornaments depend on the whim of the Transcriber, or the taste of the age. *Twenty* years are sufficient to change the fashion in this respect; and a Transcriber who had put *bears* and *dogs* in his first Manuscript, might, perhaps, twenty years after, write another with human figures in it, either to catch the Purchaser, or to make believe that they were more antient than the others.

I will mention only one instance of this fraudulent device. There is a Manuscript in the King's Library, which is very antient, by the account given of it; for they make it above six hundred years old. But who could attribute to it such a venerable æra, except the *Jew Merchant* who first sold it, or some other *Hebraist*, who was not at all acquainted with the *Hebrew Characters* of the different ages? Indeed, by examining *myself* the form of those in this volume, I discovered it to be a very modern one, and perhaps above one hundred years later than the invention of printing. To be sure there are very curious and extraordinary figures to be seen in it, and it has the *Marginal notes* in the margin. So that the age of it may be the same as the *very elegant and valuable Manuscript of Aberdeen* *. For it is equal in beauty, it has the like embellishments, and the Characters are the same. From whence I conclude that they were both written by the same person, about the 15th Century, or perhaps still later.

These, however, Sir, are the best part of your materials. I have actually selected those, which you ought to make the greatest account of, both in respect of their antiquity, and of the place where they are found.

* See the state of the Collations for 1761.

By what fatality is it, that, in the enormous Catalogue of Manuscripts you present us with, (Vol. II. of your Dissertation, p. 518, & seq.) I should not find two of them so correct and pure as the *printed Hebrew Text*? This question seems to you a strange paradox, but I will explain it to you in my next Letter. For the present, give me leave, before I conclude, to amuse myself a little with two various readings, which you mention in your first Dissertation, p. 375, and which you extracted from two different Manuscripts in the *Bodleian Library*, whose encomium you likewise give us in the same Dissertation, p. 319, & seq.

These are your words.

“ As the Manuscript, No. II. has a remarkable
“ change of three words near together, I shall give
“ the printed Text, and subjoin the different readings
“ of this Manuscript.

GENESIS, CHAP. XXXVI.

v. 6. *Printed Text* בארץ כנען וילך אל ארץ מפני יעקב אחיו
Manuscript בפרן ארם וילך אל ארץ מפני עשו אחיו

“ The Historian speaks here of *Esau's* removal
“ from *Canaan* to Mount *Seir*; and therefore the
“ printed Text is the truer reading.” What an effort
of Genius!

“ Exodus, Chap. XIII. 2. Manuscript, No. I.
“ באדם ובבמה *has* באדם ובבמה.”

I don't well see what are your motives for citing such variations. Besides very improperly wasting the *time of the Public* in collating such records, you lose your own by reasoning upon them afterwards. We knew full as well as you, that in Genesis, Chap. XXXVI. 6. the subject was the departure of *Esau* from the land of *Canaan* to Mount *Seir*, and not that
of

of *Jacob* from *Padan Aram*, since, at the beginning of the verse, *Esau* is expressly named, and it follows from your Manuscript, that *Esau* went from the face of his brother *Esau*. How is it you do not perceive that you disgrace your Manuscripts yourself by exhibiting to us the blunders and absurdities they contain? If it is to shew the carelessness of the *Jewish* Transcribers, e'en throw all your Manuscripts into the fire at once, for they are all written by them.

Another reflection I have to make is, that as you use the printed Text of *Vander Hooght* for the model of your work, and by which to collate all your *Hebrew* Manuscripts, why do not you give the same readings as you find there?

E X A M P L E S.

In your first Dissertation, p. 115, you say, that in *Ezekiel*, Ch. xi. 6. there is the word חוצותיה, and *Vander Hooght's* Edition has חוצותיה

P. 167, 1 Chron. xi. 22. you put מקבצאל; in *Vander Hooght* it is מן-קבצאל

2 Sam. xxiii. 20. מן-קבצאל, and in *Vander Hooght* it is מקבצאל

P. 192, 1 Chron. xi. 31. you put הפרעתוני; it is in *Vander Hooght* הפרעתני

P. 232, Idem, xi. 47. you put ועבר, and in *Vander Hooght* it is ועובר

P. 461, Idem, xviii. 16. you put סיפר, when it is in *Vander Hooght* ספר

I am well apprized that the foregoing words are not faults, as they have the same meaning with those in the printed Text of *Vander Hooght*; but I mention them only to shew how deficient you are in

point of accuracy. It is, nevertheless, one of the most necessary qualifications for your work, and yet you seem to make no great account of it.

I have done for the present; you shall hear more from me by the next post. I have the honour to be,

S I R, &c.

LETTER

L E T T E R III.

IN my last Letter, Sir, I gave you an abstract only of the insufficiency of your materials; but slight as it may be, I believe I said enough to shew what value ought to be set upon them. However, lest you should not be satisfied with it, I now challenge you in the face of the whole world, to deposit, in the hands of your Ambassador at our Court, the best and most ancient of your 400 Manuscripts; and if, to one fault of the printed Text (of whatever kind it be) which is not marked with the Masoretic circle, nor corrected in the margin, or, to one good variation of the said Manuscript, I do not produce from it ten *gross blunders*, or *mistakes of ignorance*, I will confess myself to be the greatest of impostors, and the most impudent of mankind. Shame and reproach now hang over my head, suspended, like the fatal sword, only by a single hair; cut it if you dare.

The Errors incident to a printed book may be distinguished into three kinds: and respect the Letter or Character, the Language and the sense.

To correct the errors of the Character, nothing more is necessary than common sense and reason, to substitute in the room of the erroneous Letter, that which ought to supply its place.

To decide concerning those which relate to the Language, the Grammar of it must be thoroughly understood. And

Lastly, to discover those which affect the sense, a compleat, comprehensive knowledge of the subject is necessary. Let us proceed to a distinct consideration of these principles, and apply them.

The *Hebrew* Language is not such as common Hebraists imagine. To describe it briefly, it is sublime in it's ideas, and simple in it's narrations; it is splendid in it's expressions, and obscure in it's nature; it abounds in figures, and consists of few words.

Many acknowledge the sublimity of it's ideas, admire the splendor of it's expressions, and approve the simplicity of it's narrations; but very few know how to prize the richness of it's figures, to penetrate the obscurity of it's Genius, and to supply it's paucity of words. And must it fall to my lot to be your instructor in these things? Ought we not both of us to blush, I, a *Frenchman*, to presume to teach you; and you, an *Englishman*, to stand in need of it?

I said, Sir, that there were three kinds of Errors incident to a printed book, and that they respected the letters, the language, or the sense of it. I observed likewise, that a moderate share of reason and common sense was sufficient to correct those of the first kind. And indeed were that (for instance) as true as it is false, which you would make us believe, viz. that the reading of the printed Text in Deut. xxii. 19. is נערה*, which has no meaning, instead of נערה a damsel, and in 2 Sam. viii. 3. דור† (Davir) instead of דוד (David), yet these errors, as well as those in other Letters, whose resemblance might equally deceive the Printer and the Reviser, are so trifling, that they would not in the least impeach the goodness of the book. They are such as one easily corrects in

* I. Dissert. p. 415.

† Idem, p. 461.

the reading ; nay one often reads the word as it ought to be, without perceiving that it is printed otherwise ; and besides, there is no book, however perfect, that is entirely free from such errata ; even your own work not excepted.

But it is not the same with those errors which relate to the Language. To know them, we must be thorough masters of the Grammar ; and the *Hebrew* Grammar is perhaps the most difficult of any to understand. Independent of the peculiar Genius, which is it's Characteristick, the Elements of it are quite different from those of our *Western* Languages ; and a particular study is necessary to investigate them.

It is composed, like other Languages, of Verbs, Adverbs, Nouns, and Pronouns. Give me leave to exhibit a sketch of these four different parts ; for it will not take up much time, as I shall only mention one or two examples under each of the propositions that I lay down.

The *Hebrew* Verbs are generally formed of only three radical Letters.

They have four active Conjugations. The first is simple, and is called *Kal*, which means *light*, and presents to the mind only a simple idea, free from every circumstance of the action which it denotes ; as פָּקַד *he visited*.

The second is named *Pihel*, and is distinguished by a reduplication of the second radical, expressed by a point placed in the middle, and then it denotes an augmentation, or multiplicity of action ; as פָּקַד he *visited frequently*.

The third is called *Hiphil*, and is known by an ה put before the three radicals, and then the idea it presents is transitive, as הִפְקִיד, *he caused, he permitted, he ordered, &c. to visit*

Lastly, the fourth is named *Hithpacl*, and is formed by the two letters ה and ת prefixed to the three radicals, and then, as it partakes not only of the second conjugation, from which it borrows the point of the second radical, denoting multiplicity, but of the third also, from whence in like manner it takes the ה, which gives it the idea of transition, it consequently includes in it both these ideas, as הִתְפַּקֵּד *he has permitted, caused, commanded, &c. that they visit frequently.* Unless the Verb is susceptible of the idea of reflected action, that is, unless the Substantive, which governs it, is a Being capable of acting on itself; and then the force of the Verb ought to be expressed relative thereto, as יִתְהַלֵּל *he always praises himself*, הִתְהַלֵּל *feign thyself immediately to be dangerously ill.* Our Dictionaries have not sufficiently distinguished the force of these Conjugations; they often give no more power to the second than to the first, and they are content to admit the idea of reflected action in the fourth, without mentioning that of augmentation.

The *Hebrew* Language has few Adverbs, but it supplies them occasionally by four Letters, which Grammarians call Paragogic, the ה, ו, י, ך. They are always put at the end of words, and serve to indicate the idea which the Writer would affix to them, either of augmentation or diminution.

It has its Particles, Conjunctions, and Prepositions.

The Nouns are Masculine or Feminine, and it has no Neuters; but to express them, it most frequently uses the Feminine, though sometimes the Masculine. The Nouns have no Cases, but they are generally preceded by Particles which denote them.

In regard to the Pronouns, they are of two Sorts. First, Separable, which form a word of themselves, and are personal or relative; secondly, Inseparable, which

which make a part of the words they are joined to, and these latter are divided into two sorts—Affixes, which are placed at the end of words, and Prefixes, which are put at the beginning.

If nothing more were requisite, in order to gain the reputation of a learned Hebraist, and acquire a right to correct the Text of Holy Scripture, than to be able to conjugate the Verbs, know the Adverbs, understand the Nouns, and distinguish the Pronouns, a scholar of a year's standing might aspire to that honour; but these general notions are only an imperfect, though necessary, collection of the materials that are wanted for the work. We must be thoroughly acquainted with the genius of the Language, study its peculiarities, explain its figures, and above all be particularly careful not to mistake Hebraisms for faults. What would you think of a man, who having never learnt to draw, nor mix colours, but knowing only in general what materials were necessary for painting, should procure some pencils, grind some colours, spread a canvass, furnish himself with a pallet, and not only attempt to draw a picture, but also criticize on *Michael Angelo*, *Paul Veronese*, *Rubens*, *Titian*, and all the most celebrated Painters in the world? You would think him very absurd and preposterous, and you would have reason so to do. The same would be my opinion of any man, who, having a very superficial knowledge of the *Hebrew*, should venture to write a book on that Language, and not only extol his performance as a *Master-piece*, but even carry his rashness so far as to ridicule the only book we have in the Language. I will now present such an one, whoever he be, with some examples of the peculiar nature of the *Hebrew* Idiom. Let us begin with the Verbs.

HEBRAISMS

HEBRAISMS IN THE VERBS.

I said that there were four Conjugations, that the first was simple, and the third included in it a transitive Idea. The sacred Language uses them indiscriminately without reserve; and the first is sometimes put for the third.

EXAMPLES.

In the 6th verse of the lxxxixth Psalm, the Lord answers and says: שָׁפַת לֹא יָדַעְתִּי אֲשַׁמַּע: *I heard words which I knew not, instead of, I made to be heard words which I had not before made known.*

In the 18th verse of the ixth chapter of Jeremiah, the simple verb עֲזַבְנוּ *we forsake*, is used instead of the *Hiphil*, *we are forced to forsake*.

The Preterit is often put for the Future, and the Future for the Preterit. I shall give no examples of it, as we may see enough of them by only opening the Bible.

The Verb is frequently in the Singular, and the Nominative in the Plural Number.

EXAMPLES.

Job xii. 7. שֶׂאל נָא בְּהֵמוֹת וְתִרְדָּן: *Ask now the beasts, and it shall teach thee, instead of, they shall teach thee.*

Gen. xxxv. 26. אֵלֶּה בְּנֵי יַעֲקֹב אֲשֶׁר יָלַד לוֹ: *these are the Sons of Jacob, which was born to him, instead of, which were born to him.*

Some-

Sometimes the Verb is in the Plural, and the Nominative in the Singular Number.

EXAMPLES.

Exod. i. 10. מלחמה תקראנה כי when there *fall* out any war, instead of *falleth*.

Prov. xxviii. 1. נסו ואין רדף רשע : the wicked man *flce*, instead of *fleeth*, when no one pursueth.

The Verb is often Feminine, and the Substantive Masculine.

EXAMPLE.

Gen. xlix. 6. אל תחד כברי mine honour *be not thou united*. The Substantive כבר is Masculine, and the Verb תחד is Feminine.

Frequently the Verb is understood.

EXAMPLES.

2 Sam. xxiii. 17. הדם האנשים ההלכים בנפשותם : the blood of the men that went in jeopardy of their lives, instead of, *shall I drink* the blood of the men, &c.

Psal. iv. 3. ער מה כבודי לכלמה : how long my glory into shame, for, how long *will ye turn* my glory, &c.

Oftentimes the Verb passes from one person to another in the same phrase, without any intimation of such a sudden change.

EXAMPLES.

E X A M P L E S.

Jeremiah xxix. 19. שלחתי אליהם את עבדי הנביאים : ולא שמעתם : I sent unto *them* my servants the prophets, but *ye* would not hear them.

Genesis xlix. 4. כי עלית משכבי אביך אז חללת יצועי : because *thou* wentest up to thy father's bed : then defiledst *thou* it ; *he* went up to my couch.

HEBRAISMS OF THE ADVERBS.

The Adverb is frequently twice repeated ; and then it gives an additional force to the idea.

E X A M P L E S.

Deut. xxviii. 43. יעלה עליך מעלה מעלה : he shall get up above thee, *above, above* ; that is to say, he shall be *thy master*.

ואתה תרד מטה מטה and thou shalt come down *below, below*, that is, thou shalt be his slave. This Hebraism is very common.

Frequently the Adverb denotes a fixed time, when it is indeterminate.

E X A M P L E S.

Isaiah xxx. 33. כי ערוך מאתמול תפתה for Tophet is ordained of *yesterday*, for, *of old*.

2 Sam. xv. 20. בואך תמול thou camest *yesterday*, that is, *not long ago*.

The Adverb oftentimes makes a Comparison, when it is an affirmation.

EXAMPLES.

E X A M P L E S.

Job xxiv. 14. לאור יקום רוצח ובלילה יהי כנגב
 the murderer riseth with the light and in the
 night is *as* a Thief, instead of, is *a Thief*.

Pfalm cxxii. 3. ירושלם הבנויה כעיר ; *Jerusalem*
 shall be built *as* a City, &c. for *Jerusalem* shall be
 built *a* City, &c.

Oftentimes on the contrary, the comparative Ad-
 verb is understood.

E X A M P L E S.

Exod. xix. 4. ואשא אתכם על כנפי נשרים and I
 bare you on Eagles Wings, for, *as* on Eagles Wings.

Pfalm cxxv. 2. ירושלם הרים סביב לה ויהוה סביב לעמו
 the mountains are round about *Jerusalem*, and
 the Lord round about his people, instead of *as* the
 mountains, &c. *so* the Lord, &c.

The comparative Adverb seems frequently to be
 used without occasion, and to form a Pleonasm.

E X A M P L E S.

Pfalm xlix. 13. נמשל כבהמות become like *as* the
 beasts, for, like the beasts.

Job xxx. 19. ואתמשל כעפר ואפר and I am become
 like *as* dust and ashes, instead of, I am become like
 dust and ashes.

HEBRAISMS IN THE NOUNS.

The Substantive is oftentimes twice repeated.

EXAMPLES.

E X A M P L E S.

Deut. xvi. 20. צדק צדק תרדף thou shalt follow *just*, *just*, that is, thou shalt follow that which is *altogether just*.

Jeremiah iv. 19. כעי מעי אוחילה *in my bowels, in my bowels*, I am pained, that is, there is no part of my stomach in which I am not pained.

Frequently the Substantive is wanting, and is understood.

E X A M P L E S.

Gen. xlii. 30. דבר האיש ארני הארץ אתנו קשות the man, the Lord of the land spake hard (*words*) to us.

Isaiah xxx. 16. ועל קל נרכב, and we will ride upon a swift (*horse*)

Oftentimes the Adjective is understood.

E X A M P L E S.

Gen. xxxvi. 6. וילך אל ארץ and went into (*another*) country.

Prov. xviii. 22. משה מצא טוב who so findeth a (*good*) wife findeth happiness.

The Substantive is frequently used for the Adjective.

E X A M P L E S.

EXAMPLES.

Gen. xlv. 34. תועבת מצרים כל רעה צאן every Shepherd is the *abomination* of the *Egyptians*, instead of, is *abominable* unto the *Egyptians*.

Canticles i. 17. קרות בתינו ארזים רחיטנו קרית the beams of our houses are cedars, our rafters are firs, for, *cedar*, and *fir*.

Oftentimes a plural Substantive is joined to a singular Adjective.

EXAMPLES.

Gen. xlvii. 3. עבדיך צאן רעה thy servants are a *shepherd*, instead of *shepherds*.

Isaiah xvi. 8. שדמות חשבון אמלל the fields of Heshbon *is languid*, for, *are languid*.

The Feminine is often used for the Neuter.

EXAMPLES.

Gen. i. 20. ואתם חשבתם עלי רעה אלהים חשבה and טבה are Feminine Adjectives.

Psalms xxvii. 4. אחת שאלתי אותה אבקש אחת and אותה are Feminine Adjectives.

The Masculine is used in the same manner; the examples of it are common.

Frequently the Singular Number is put for the Plural.

EXAMPLES.

E X A M P L E S.

Gen. xlix. 6. עקרו שור : they flew
a man they digged down a wall, for, men and
walls.

Lev. xi. 2. זאת הוזה אשר תאכלו : *this is the beast*
which you shall eat, for, *these are the beasts*, &c.

And the Plural for the Singular.

E X A M P L E .

Gen. xix. 11. הכו בסטורים : they smote with *blind-*
nesses, for *blindness*. This Hebraism is very common,
and is used to express the *greatness* or *power* of the
subject.

Oftentimes the last of two Substantives, separated
by the Conjunction ו (and) is to be rendered by the
Genitive.

E X A M P L E S.

Gen. iii. 16. ארבה עצבונך והרנך I will multiply
thy sorrow and thy conception, for, I will multiply the
sorrows of thy conception.

Jeremiah xxxvi. 27. שרף המלך את הכנולה ואת
הדברים the King burnt the roll, and the words, for,
the roll of the words.

Frequently there is an inversion of the two Sub-
stantives.

E X A M P L E S.

Joshua ii. 6. ותטמנם בפשתי העץ and she hid them
under flax of stalk, for, under stalks of flax.

Prov.

Prov. xxvi. 23. כסף סינים, silver of dross, for, dross of silver.

The Substantive is often used for the Adverb.

EXAMPLES.

Psal. lxxv. 3. אני מישרים אשפט, I will judge right things, for, *righteously*.

Prov. xxxi. 9. שפט צדק : judge *righteousness*, for, judge *righteously*.

The absolute form is often used for that in Regimine.

EXAMPLES.

1 Kings xxii. 27. ומים לחץ : and waters of affliction—for לחץ.

2 Kings iii. 4. ומאה אלף אילים צמר : and an hundred thousand rams, with their wool, for, אילי צמר.

And the Form in Regimine for the Absolute.

EXAMPLES.

Num. v. 18. מי המרים : bitter waters, for, המרים.

Isaiah xxxiii. 6. חכמת ודעת : wisdom and knowledge, for, חכמה.

HEBRAISMS OF THE PRONOUNS.

The Pronoun demonstrative is often used instead of the Substantive.

F

EXAMPLES.

E X A M P L E S.

Psaln cxiv. 2. היתה יהודה לקדשו ישראל ממשלותיו :
Judah was *his* Sanctuary, and Israel *his* Dominion,
that is, the Sanctuary and Dominion of *the Lord*.

Esther ix. 25. ובבאה לפני המלך : and when *she*
came before the King (that is, *Esther*).

The Substantive is frequently repeated instead of
the Pronoun.

E X A M P L E S.

Gen. xii. 5. ויצאו ללכת ארצה כנען ויבאו ארצה כנען ;
and they went forth to go into the land of Canaan,
and into *the land of Canaan* they came, for, into *that*
land.

Psaln xxv. 9. ידריך עניים במשפט וילמד עניים דרכו .
He shall lead the afflicted in judgment, and he shall
teach the *afflicted* his way, for, he shall teach *them*.

The Demonstrative is often put for the Relative.

E X A M P L E S.

Psaln civ. 8. אל מקום זה יסדת להם : unto *that* place
which thou hast founded for them, instead of, unto
the place which thou hast founded for them.

Psaln cxlii. 4. בארץ זו אהלך טמנו פה לי : in *that*
way, wherein I walked, have they laid a snare for me,
for, in *the* way wherein I walked.

Sometimes the Pronoun is Masculine, when it's
Substantive is Feminine.

EXAMPLES.

E X A M P L E S.

Exodus xi. 6. והיתה צעקה גדלה בכל ארץ מצרים אשר ; and there shall be a great cry in all the land of Egypt, *such* as there was none like it, nor shall be like it any more. The word *cry* is Feminine in the Hebrew, and the Pronoun is Masculine.

Judges xix. 24. הנה בתי הבתולה ופילגשהו אוציאה : נא אותם : behold, my daughter, a maiden, and his concubine, *them* I will bring out now. The Pronoun *them* occurs in the Masculine *three times* in this verse.

The Pronoun is frequently of a different number from the Substantive.

E X A M P L E S.

Joshua ii. 4. ותקה האשה את שני האנשים ותצפנו : and the woman took the two men, and hid *him*, for, hid *them*.

Psaln xxxv. 8. תבואהו שואה destruction shall come upon *him*, for, upon *them*. The Pronoun is three times in the Singular in this verse, though, in the preceding verses, the Substantive and the Verbs which it governs are in the Plural.

The Relative Qui, quæ, quod, is often understood.

E X A M P L E S.

Genesis xxxix. 4. וכל יש לו נתן בידו *et omnia erant sibi, dedit in manu ejus*, for, *quæ erant*, &c. And he put into his hand all *that* he had.

Isaiah vi. 6. ובידו רצפה במלקחים לקח מעל המזבח *Et in manu ejus carbo, in forcipibus tulerat desuper altare :*
F a and

and in his hand a live coal, *which* he had taken with the tongs from off the altar.

Sometimes the Relative and Antecedent are understood.

E X A M P L E S.

Exodus iv. 13. שלח נא ביד תשלח : send, I pray thee by the hand (*of him whom*) thou wilt send.

Prov. viii. 32. ואשרי דרכי ישמרו : blessed (*the men who*) keep my ways.

Frequently the Pronoun is used jointly with the Substantive.

E X A M P L E.

Gen. ii. 17. ומעץ הדעת טוב ורע לא תאכל ממנו But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat *of it*. This Hebraism is very common, as well as the repetition of the Pronoun with the Relative, *qui, quæ, quod, &c.* It would be wasting time to give examples of it.

Besides these general Hebraisms, and many others not unknown, which make part of the peculiarity of the Language, there are the four paragogic Letters I before mentioned, the ה, the ו, the י, and the נ. They are used to encrease or lessen the force of the words to which they are joined. I will give only an example or two of each.

The Letter ה is joined to the Verb.

E X A M P L E.

Jeremiah iii. 25. נשכבה בבשתנו : the Verb שכב means only *jacere*; and then, if it is rendered simply
by

by *jacemus*, the force that the Prophet intended to give it, by joining ה to it, is not expressed: we must therefore add an Adverb, as *ignominiosè*, or *turpiter*, or *tristè jacemus in opprobrio nostro*: we lie down sorrowfully, or *ignominiously*, &c.

It is joined to Particles.

E X A M P L E.

Lam. i. 1. איכה should not be rendered simply by *quomodo*, how; because the Particle איך alone has that signification: but the ה which is joined to it ought to be expressed, and it should be translated, *quo funesto casu*: by what fatal misfortune.

It is joined to the Pronoun Affix.

E X A M P L E.

Jer. vii. 27. ולא יענוכה ought not to be translated simply, *but they will not answer thee*: but to express the ה it should be rendered; they will not answer thy repeated cries.

Robertson erroneously considers the ה in this verse as a fault of the Transcriber. I do not agree with the learned man in that determination, for it is not to be doubted that the Letter is energetic here, as in many other Verbs.

It is joined to Nouns.

E X A M P L E.

ישועתה an entire deliverance, אימתה a terrible fear, עזרתה a ready assistance.

In short, to sum up the whole in one word, the ה is never useless. If it is affixed, it is either energetic or local. If it is prefixed, it is either demonstrative or interrogative, and often energetic, especially when it precedes a Pronoun.

The Letter ו is alike energetic. It is generally put at the end of Nouns, Pronouns, and Particles.

E X A M P L E S.

Pfalm ii. 3. ננתקה מוסרותימו ונשליכה מומנו עבתימו. ^{את}
The two Verbs in this passage have each an ה, and the Substantives a ו energetic; they ought then to be expressed according to the idea of the Prophet: Let us *violently* break their *grievous* bonds; let us cast away *with scorn* their *heavy* yoke.

Pfalm l. 10. חיתו יער; the *fierce* beast of the forest.

xxi. 11. פרימי מארץ תאבד: their *wicked* fruit shalt thou destroy from the earth.

ii. 4. אדני ילעג למו: the Lord shall laugh to scorn these *mad* men.

5. או ידבר אלימו: then shall he speak to these *rebels*.

xvii. 10. פיו דברו בנאות: their *ungodly* mouth speaketh *exceeding* proudly.

Exodus xv. 5. כמו אבן: as *rapidly* as a stone.

Pfalm lviii. 5. כמו פתן: (their poison is) as *deadly* as that of the asp, &c.

The Letter י has the same power. It is joined to Nouns.

E X A M P L E S.

Pfalm cx. 4. על דברתי מלכי צדק: after the *excellent* order of Melchisedek.

Lam.

Lam. i. 1. רבתי עם : *very full of people.*

Ibid. רבתי בגוים : *very great among the nations.*

Ibid. שרתי במדינות : *the chief princes among the provinces.*

To Verbs.

E X A M P L E S.

Ruth. iii. 3. ושמתי שמלתיך עליך : and thou shalt put *carefully* upon thee thy *best* raiment. ושמתי קרי וירדת קרי
וירדתי הגר : and thou shalt get thee down *secretly* to the floor.

Ruth iii. 4. וגלית מרגלתי ושכבתי : and uncover his feet, and lay thee down *silently*. ושכבת קרי

To Participles.

Gen. xlix. 11. אסרי לגפן עירה : *binding without fear* his sole unto the vine.

Isaiah xxii. 16. חקקי בסלע משכן לו : that graveth himself *in vain* an habitation in the rock.

Jeremiah x. 17. יושבתי במצור : *dwelling securely* in his strong hold. יושבת קרי

Lastly, the ך is added at the end of Verbs, and serves to increase or diminish their force.

E X A M P L E S.

Isaiah xiii. 8. ידחילו : they shall be in *exceeding* pain.

יִנְעֲנוּ Psalm lix. 16. יִנְעֲנוּ they shall wander every
קֵר where.

The second chapter of Genesis, and the seventeenth verse supplies us with a striking example of this Hebraism. The Lord expressly forbids Adam to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, and says to him, if thou eatest thereof, מוֹת תָּמוּת dying thou shalt dye (which is another Hebraism, signifying *thou shalt surely die*). But the woman, in her answer to the insidious question put by the Tempter, says, we may eat of the fruit of the trees of the Garden, but of the fruit of the Tree which is in the midst of the Garden, God hath said, ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, פֶּן־תָּמוּתוּ left ye *chance* to die. Eve, on the point of yielding to the temptation, endeavours, as we may plainly see, to lessen the force of the terms of the prohibition, by adding the Particle פֶּן, *ne forte*, and a qualifying ׀. The Devil on the contrary encourages her by an expression which contains two Hebraisms, the repetition of the word, and the energetic Letter, לֹא מוֹת תָּמוּת: *most certainly* ye shall not die.

Let us now proceed to the Particles, which deserve some attention.

P A R T I C L E S.

I understand by this generical name, the Prepositions, Conjunctions, Interjections, and also some Adverbs.

They are either simple, as אֵת and כִּי, or compound, as מֵאֵת and כִּכָּה.

The most common among the simple are ו and כִּי, which our Versions usually render by *et* and *quia*; though they have very frequently another signification.

The

The ו often includes a consequent idea.

E X A M P L E.

Ecclef. ii. 26. נתן חכמה ודעת ושמחה he giveth wisdom, and knowledge, *and* joy ; that is, wisdom and knowledge *the sources of* true joy.

It is rendered by an Adverb of time when preceded by some Particles, which are used as conditional Conjunctions, or Conjunctions of time.

E X A M P L E.

Jeremiah vii. 5. כי אם הישיב תישיבו את דרכיכם

7. ושכנתי אתכם

For if you thoroughly amend your ways *then* I will cause you to dwell, &c.

It is often an alternative Conjunction.

E X A M P L E.

Jeremiah xvii. 25. רכבים ורכב ובטוסים riding in chariots, *or* on horses. Unless we translate it, some riding in chariots ; others riding on horses.

It is sometimes suppressed in the Text.

E X A M P L E S.

Ecclef. ix. 15. ומצא בה איש מסכן חכם now there was found in it a poor man, *but* wise.

Jeremiah vii. 24. וילכו במעצות בשררות לבם הרע but they walked in the counsels, *and* in the imagination of their evil heart.

In

In a word, the meaning assigned to these two Particles ו and כי, may, and ought to be, such as the sense, the connection of the thoughts, and the nature of the idiom, into which the *Hebrew* is translated, require.

There are other Particles to which our Dictionaries give but one or two significations at most; and often, in particular passages, neither of them will make good sense. In this case, we are not to impute it to the ignorance of the Transcriber or Printer, but to the barrenness of the Dictionaries; and have recourse to a sure rule; which is, that whenever the common signification cannot be applied to the sense of the Text at all, or but indifferently, we must examine the relation between that Particle and the others in the same verse, and we shall then infallibly find its true meaning.

E X A M P L E.

Ecclef. ii. 16. ואֵין יָמוֹת הַחֲכָמִים עִם הַכְסִּיל.

We look for אֵין, and we find no other meanings for it than the interrogatives *quomodo* and *ubinam*, *how?* *where then?* As we can use neither of them, and there is no sense in asking *how*, or *where then* shall the wise man die with the foolish? we have recourse to this rule, we find אֵין in relation with עִם; and this same relation plainly shews that this Particle must here signify *similiter*, *pariter*, *in like manner*, *alike*: The wise and the foolish die *alike*.

I shall not pretend to exhibit to you all the simple Particles: the rule which I have now laid down for ו and אֵין may be applied to all those which have not a fixed, invariable, and determinate meaning; and of the last kind there are very few.

C O M.

COMPOUND PARTICLES.

These have more force than the simple; and though the Dictionaries usually confound them under the same signification, it is nevertheless true that the energy intended by the Letter, and sometimes by the syllable which is added to the simple word, ought to be expressed. Not to be tedious, I will mention only one example.

The Adverb יחד signifies *und, simul, together*. Now in many places of Holy Scripture it is found compounded יחדו, and yet the same signification is given to it, without paying any attention to the addition of the ו; which is a culpable neglect. We are to know that the *Hebrew* language is not set off, with useless Letters or Syllables; and we shall never attain to the energy, the majesty, and the nervous expressions of the *Hebrew* Text in a Translation, but in proportion to our attention in expressing the sense of these Letters.

E X A M P L E S.

Jeremiah, v. 5. יחדו שברו עול. These words ought not to be rendered simply by, *They have altogether broken the yoke*. It is enervating the meaning of the Prophet: it should be translated, *With one common effort*.

Hosea, ii. 2. ונקבצו יחדו..... And they shall assemble together...*in perfect union*.

It is the same with מאין, מאת, מבלי, מדוע, &c. &c. and with all other compound Particles, the greatest part of which include a modifying idea, which cannot be rendered but by a Substantive or an Adjective.

I shall

I shall confine myself to this short Sketch of the Hebraisms, as it is sufficient to shew any impartial person, how different the genius of this Language is from that of our Western Languages. Though this knowledge is absolutely necessary that we may not mistake Hebraisms for errors in the Language, it is by no means sufficient in order to decide concerning those which we imagine to be errors in the sense. This is the third kind, of which I am now to speak a few words.

In order to discover the true meaning of a difficult passage, many things are necessary. Besides the knowledge of the Hebraisms, on which we must always have our eyes fixed, to make a proper application of them on every occasion, it is also indispensably requisite to know and understand thoroughly the three principal styles of Holy Scripture, the Historical, the Moral, and the Prophetical. And we must be particularly careful not to confound the literal sense with the figurative*. As you are not, perhaps, acquainted with this distinction, I will inform you what it is; for I would not have you accuse me of speaking to you in an unknown tongue.

The *literal* sense is nothing more than the sense of the words taken grammatically, and in their natural signification. For example, פְּרוֹת means *kine*. That is the literal sense: and this word, in the reading, presents to me no other idea than that of *kine*.

* The words here translated the *literal* and the *figurative sense* would be, if strictly rendered from the *French*, the *sense of the Letter*, and the *literal sense*; but as that seems to be in our Language a distinction without a difference, and the Author, from his own explanation of the terms, evidently means, by the *sense of the Letter*, the plain obvious sense of the words; and, by the *literal sense*, what we call the *figurative* meaning couched under them, the Translator thinks he may be justified in rendering the terms as he has done.

The

The *figurative* sense is the meaning which is couched under the *literal*. For example, *Amos* thus begins his fourth Chapter :

שמעו הרבר הזה פרות הבשן *Hear this word ye kine of Basban, or fat kine.*

Certainly it is not to *kine* that the Prophet speaks, but to Beings capable of understanding his words. Now, it is these Beings described under the name of *kine* that we are to find out, and whose designation constitutes the figurative sense.

Hear this word, ye *fat kine* ; that is the literal sense. Hear this word, ye *haughty and voluptuous Princes* of Samaria ; that is the figurative sense.

This word has suggested to me a reflection, which I cannot help communicating to you, as it may possibly afford you some amusement.

There is not really any great difference between פרות, *kine*, and פחות, *Princes*. Amongst your Farago of Manuscripts might not one of them have this last word in it? I do not know that it is so; but let us suppose it for a moment. I represent to myself then a Transcriber of the last age, or perhaps a Contemporary, who is eager to fabricate from the printed Text a Manuscript respectable for its antiquity. As he knows how to read and write *Hebrew*, and understands a little of the Language, finding this passage in *Amos*, *Hear this word*, פרות הבשן ye *kine of Basban*, he stops, reflects, and presently concludes, that it cannot be right. " This is certainly an error, says he to himself ; " but פחות means *Princes*, let us e'en put that down ; " it is more noble to address the discourse to *Princes of Basban*, than to *kine* of the Country." And so פחות is entered on record. How many thousand variations are in the same taste!

I next trace this Manuscript in its progress, and I see it after a few years direct its course towards some famous

famous Library; where it is received and treated with that respect which is due only to venerable antiquity. A date is then fixed to it, and that is enough. At last it is intrusted to the care of some curiously learned man to extract its variations. And here my imagination presents to itself a very extraordinary scene. Methinks I see *five* or *six* dirty Boys placed round their Master, muttering some oaths, and comparing old rags of Manuscripts with the printed Text. One of them has in his hand my Manuscript, he lights upon this passage in Amos, and finds in his copy פרוֹת *Princes*; and then turning back to the printed Text, he there sees פְּרוֹת *kine*. Ah, Master, exclaims he, with some emotion, How horrid! the printed Text reads *kine*. The old Hebraist runs to him, cocks his glass, compares the two readings himself, and applauds—what? the ignorance of his Pupil, and of the Transcriber. A variation of the *utmost consequence*! A shout of joy; an *anathema* on the printed Text; a canonization of Manuscripts without *reserve*. Don't you think my reveries very pleasant? But to return.

I say then, that to discover the *figurative* sense of Holy Scripture, we ought fully to understand the different styles in which it is written. There is none more difficult than the prophetic; but we shall in vain endeavour to dispel this darkness, if we are ignorant of the causes of it: we must begin then with discovering them, and know,

1st. That the prophetic Books are full of reticencies; that is, that there are numberless passages where the Phrases are not compleat, and where the Translator is obliged to supply the Verb, or word that is wanting, in order to give to the idea, intended by the Prophet, all the perspicuity that it requires.

E X A M-

E X A M P L E.

The reading in Pf. LXXV. is, { v. 7. כִּי לֹא מִמּוֹצֵא וּמִמְעַרְב וְלֹא
מִמְדְּבַר הָרִים
v. 8. כִּי אֱלֹהִים שֹׁפֵט

v. 7. *For it is neither from the east, nor from the west, nor from the desert mountains.*

v. 8. *But God is the Judge.*

It must be evident to every one, that in the words of the 7th verse, the sense is not compleat. But the text will not therefore be exclaimed against as being corrupt, except by the *ignorant*; for the *true* Hebraist, who has studied the prophetic style, sees at first view the reticency, and looks from whence to supply what is wanting. He has not far to go, for he finds it in the first words of the following verse. He takes the Participle שֹׁפֵט (Judge) and gives it a retroactive effect; he refers it back and applies it to the phrase, which has no verb, and translates it; "It is neither from the east, nor from the west, nor from the desert mountains *that the Judge shall come*; it is God who is the Judge."

I will give you another Example, which perhaps you will not be sorry to see.

Hosea in his first Chapter relates the Command, given him by the Lord in these words:

v. 2. { וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל הוֹשֵׁעַ לֵךְ קַח לְךָ אִשָּׁת זְנוּנִים
וְיִלְדֵי זְנוּנִים כִּי זִנָּה תִזְנֶה הָאָרֶץ מֵאַחֲרַי יְהוָה

Literally. *And the Lord said unto Hosea: Go, take unto thee a wife of whoredoms, and children of whoredoms; for the land by whoring hath committed whoredom against the Lord.*

How many Hebraisms and Difficulties are here!

The

The Infidel with confidence quotes this verse as a proof, that the Lord not only permits, but even commands the contrary to his own law; and already exulting in his victory, he erects on this text a trophy to impiety and irreligion. The true Hebraist, however, is moved neither with the triumphant shouts, nor with the security of his adversary, but attentively examines the text, and immediately recollects, that the Prophets, when speaking of Idolatry, seldom describe it by any other terms than those of fornication and adultery. This is a fact which cannot be denied.

The veil of this enigmatical term being thus removed, a small ray of light is thrown on the meaning of the verse. For it would be less repugnant to say, Take an idolatrous wife, and Children of Idolatry, than to say, take a Wife of Whoredoms, and Children of Whoredoms; because by taking an idolatrous wife, the Children may be also Idolaters; but by taking even a prostitute for a lawful wife, the Children by her are legitimate, and can never be called or reputed Children of Whoredoms; but in this explication there still remains an insuperable difficulty. In the Law of Moses there is an express prohibition, not only against taking a wife that is a whore, (Levit. xxi. 7.) but also against contracting marriage with Idolaters. (Deut. vii. 3) The Lord therefore cannot command his Prophet to do either; so that the true sense of the prophecy is not yet discovered. But by an application of his principles, the true Hebraist will, in the same verse, find this difficulty resolved; for independently on the first reticency between זָנוּיִם and יְלָדָיו, which the Conjunctive ו indicates, and which good sense alone shews must be supplied by these words, *procrea filios*, beget Children, he examines the latter part of the Text, and he there finds these words; *for the Land by whoring hath committed whoredom*
from

from after the Lord. This double Hebraism of the repetition of the Verb and the compound Particle does not stop him; for, being accustomed to the genius of the prophetic style, he renders the repetition of the Verb by an Adverb of energy (*hath committed whoredom shamefully*) and the compound Particle by a Verb, (*departing from the Lord.*)

But he fixes his whole attention upon this word, the LAND *which hath committed whoredom shamefully*, and reasons thus: "My Religion teaches me, that God cannot command any thing contrary to his Law: common sense and reason tell me, that Children born in lawful marriage cannot be Children of Whoredoms. It is therefore neither on the Mother nor the Children that the infamy of this epithet is to light. Upon whom then will it fall? Upon the Land, which, to commit whoredom with Idols, departs from the Lord. Now if it be the land which commits whoredom, as the Prophet himself says, this wife, that he is to take by command of the Lord, is no longer a wife of whoredoms, but a wife of the *land* of whoredoms; and the children born of her, will be, for the same reason, children *born in the land* of whoredoms; that is, of Idolatry." In order to give a reasonable, just, and orthodox sense to the text, we have only to take the word אֶרֶץ, *land*, which is in the latter part of the verse, and, by the rule of reticency, carry it to the former part, and it is the Substantive which governs the whole.

But further, the cause of such a command should be enquired into. The Children of Israel had been given up for near two Centuries to the most shameful Idolatry. To draw them from it, the Lord had for a long time threatened them with the severest judgments: at last he makes use of the ministry of Hosea. Go, says he to him, take a wife in this land of Idolatry,

latory, and beget children. The Prophet obeys, he marries and has children: but the Lord himself names them, he calls one of them *לֹא רַחֲמֵהוּ* *I will no more have mercy*, and another *לֹא עַמִּי* *ye are not my people*. The intention of the Lord in this transaction was to set before the eyes of this ungrateful people, children whose names should be a proof, a memento, a constant, living monument of his indignation against them, and of the miseries he was about to bring upon them. This was the design of the marriage, which he commanded his Prophet to contract. Was it necessary for this purpose that his Prophet should take a Wife of Whoredoms? and is it not insulting the infinite holiness of the God we serve, to make him give his Minister such a command?

This is the manner in which the Christian Hebraist studies the Holy Scriptures, and reasons on them. But whether your method is the same is a question I shall consider presently.

2dly. Enallages occur frequently in the sacred writings. There is a continual change of tenses, moods, conjugations, numbers, genders, and persons. I have given some examples of them in the Hebraisms of the Verbs, and therefore I shall content myself here with laying down one single rule, as a sure guide in the midst of the obscurity occasioned by the change of Tenses and Moods in the prophetic books.

The object which the sacred Writer has in view must be attentively considered: if he treats of future events, the Preterits are to be changed into Futures, and the Futures left as they are. If his subject is present events, the Preterits and Futures must be put in the present; and lastly, if the Prophet relates past transactions, Preterits are to be substituted for Futures. Every thing depends on rightly apprehending the figurative sense.

3dly. The

3dly. The Hebrew Scriptures abound with figurative terms; with metaphorical, enigmatical, parabolical, and symbolical expressions, which spread a thick veil over the true meaning of the Prophecies. The first Chapter of Ezekiel is a rich embroidery of symbolical figures, as the song of Habbakuk is of enigmatical. Now, is it by looking for, or supposing faults in the printing, that the meaning of these Chapters is to be discovered? No, Sir, you might consult *ten thousand* Manuscripts, and give account of *two millions* of variations, without throwing any light upon them. It is learning that is necessary to explain them; it is a sound judgment free from every prejudice; a particular attention in examining whether these figurative words are not used elsewhere, and in what sense; a skill to compare their agreement one with another, and trace them all back to their first source. In a word, it is the ability of assigning to them their true significations, and applying each of them to that particular which the Prophet intended to point out. And do you think that this is to be learnt by collating old Parchments?

4thly. There are general and indeterminate words, which must be restrained to a particular sense, and particular words which must be extended to that general meaning, which the sense and connection of the ideas require.

E X A M P L E S.

Isaiah xiii. וְפָקַדְתִּי עַל-תְּבַלְרָעָה: *and I will punish the world for their evil.* Certainly the whole world is not to be understood by the word here used; for the Prophet is foretelling the overthrow of Babylon only.

Zach. xi. 1. פתח לבנון דלתיד ותאכל אש בארזיו:
Open thy doors, O Lebanon, that the fire may devour thy cedars.

Every one perceives that Lebanon is here a particular word, that must have a more general sense, and be extended to the object whose destruction the Prophet proclaims.

5thly. It is very common in the prophetical writings to find a change of persons, without any thing in the text to intimate it; and yet it is a figure to be carefully attended to, lest what the Prophet says, or those say to whom he addresses himself, should be made to come from the mouth of the Lord, and *vice versa*.

The second Psalm is a proof of this; where the Church, the Ungodly, the Messiah, and the Prophet all speak alternately.

6thly. Lastly, there is in the Sacred Books, an harmony and connection of ideas, which we must never lose sight of when we have once found it; and which we must look for and discover, when obscured by Hebraisms. It is one of the surest marks of the goodness of a Translation, and the sense given to difficult passages, when the connexion preserved between what precedes and follows is easy and natural.

These, Sir, are in general the most essential principles of the *Hebrew* Language; they are acknowledged by all Graminarians, and I am only their echo in reciting them. You will say, without doubt, that you know them as well as I do; and that it is an insult to think of teaching you. And I answer by an argument which admits of no reply: Either you do know them, or you do not. If you do not know them, I am so far from offering you any insult by attempting to teach you, that I expect from your gratitude a very handsome present for my trouble. If you do know them, why do you not make use of them? Why have
 you

you given such an arbitrary explanation of the five first Verses of the 33d Chapter of Deuteronomy in your first Dissertation, page 422. I shall examine your pretended corrections in my next Letter, and shew that the readings you propose are of no more value than the Manuscripts you make use of.

I have the honour to be, Sir, &c.

L E T T E R IV.

S I R,

IF my plan had been only to ascertain the value of the materials by which you pretend to improve the printed Text, and to give a Specimen of the peculiar genius of the *Hebrew* Language, I believe that the little I have said on these points would be sufficient to enable any unprejudiced person to form a judgment of both: but

Arma virumque cano.

Arms and the MAN I sing.

It is *yourself* that I now attack: it is the various readings, which you mention as of great consequence, when they are only the effects of ignorance or carelessness in your Manuscripts; it is your imaginary, and at best useless corrections. In a word, it is your inconclusive and often contradictory reasonings. But before I enter on the subject, I think myself obliged, for the sake of those who are not sufficiently acquainted with *Hebrew*, to give an explanation of the Masoretic Words which occur in the margin of the printed Text.

1st. קרי signifies, Read the word which you see in the Text, marked with a small circle (°) above it, as it stands in the margin,

E X A M P L E.

E X A M P L E.

MARGIN. הַגְדוֹל קָרִי that is, <i>read</i> } הַגְדוֹל	. . . ; .	TEXT. דִּגְבֹּל . Joshua, xv. 47.
---	------------------	--

2d. קרי ולא כתיב signifies, Read the word written in the margin, though it be not in the Text; and then in the place where the word should be, a space is left marked with the circle.

E X A M P L E.

MARGIN. בְּאִים קָרִי ולא כתיב, that is, <i>read</i> בְּאִים } though it be not writ- ten in the Text.	} v. 38.	TEXT. Jeremiah xxxi. הִנֵּה יָמִים . . . נָא יְהוָה .
---	-----------------	--

3d. קרי ולא כתיב signifies, Read not the word, though it be in the Text, and the Circle is over the word, which should be suppressed.

E X A M P L E.

MARGIN. חֲמֹשׁ כְּתִיב ולא קָרִי, that is, <i>read not the</i> word חֲמֹשׁ tho' it be written in the Text.	} Ezek. xlviii. 16.	TEXT. חֲמֹשׁ חֲמֹשׁ מֵאוֹת .
---	----------------------------	---

4. חסר signifies, Such a Letter is wanting. Now the Letter which is wanting is put in the margin after this word; and the place where it ought to be in the Text is marked with the circle.

E X A M P L E.

MARGIN.

TEXT.

חסר, that is, } Numb. xv. 24. . . . לחט"ת
 N is wanting }

5. יתיר or יתירה signifies, that the Letter marked with the circle in the Text is redundant.

E X A M P L E.

MARGIN.

TEXT.

יתירה That is, }
 the is redundant. } Deut. xxxii. 13. . . . במוותי

יתיר That is, }
 the is redundant. } Psalm xvi. 10. . . . חסידך

I am not in the least surprized, that these Notes incur your displeasure, because they are an obstacle in the way of that rage which possesses you for finding faults in the printed Text; but what astonishes me is, that you should speak of them as *Maforetic Corruptions*. It is a very bold assertion; and surely you are not aware of the consequence.

In your second Dissertation, p 328 and 329, you thus express yourself:

“As this kind of evidence, which I then produced, was new; and yet, as it seems to be the strongest argument to prove, that the Authors of the Ancient Versions did frequently read differently from our printed Text, I shall throw together *some* of the many various readings (in the *Hebrew Manuscripts*) which were produced in my Dissertation, as being the very readings expressed in the *GREEK Version*, &c.”

You

You then add two Columns of thirty-six *Hebrew* Words, one from your Manuscripts, and the other from the printed Text. As I do not love to be prolix, I shall select from the whole only the six following:

PRINTED TEXT.	MANUSCRIPT.
Joshua xv. 47. הגבול . . .	. . . הגדול 1. Manuscript.
Judges xvi. 18. לה . . .	. . . לי 4. Manuscripts.
1 Samuel ii. 3. ולא . . .	. . . ולו Idem.
1 Kings xii. 33. מלבר . . .	. . . מלבו 2. Manuscripts.
Psalms xvi. 10. חסידך . . .	. . . חסידך 17. Manuscripts.
Ezekiel xlii. 16. אמות . . .	. . . מאות 3. Manuscripts.

First, it seems very strange to me, that, when you are pointing out the difference between the readings in the printed Text and your Manuscripts, you should not only conceal the corrections made in the printed Text by the Masoretic Notes, but even deny in express words that there are any such, though they are plain enough to be seen in the printed Editions, and particularly in that of *Vander Hooght*, with which you collate all your Manuscripts. To be so sparing of the Truth is not *good* œconomy. I will set them down as they are marked in the printed Text, and contradict me, if you can.

MARGINAL CORRECTIONS.	PRINTED TEXT.	Manuscripts.
קרי read, הגדול	Joshua xv. 47. הגבול	. . . הגדול
קרי read, לי	Judges xvi. 18. לה	. . . לי
קרי read, ולו	1 Sam. ii. 3. ולא	. . . ולו

Marginal

MARGINAL
CORRECTIONS.

PRINTED TEXT.

MANUSCRIPTS.

מלבו מלבו Kings xii. 33. מלבו

חסידיך חסידיך Psalm xvi. 10. חסידיך
 that is, the second is re-
 dundant.

מאז מאז Ezekiel xlii. 16. מאז

Secondly, it is very evident that the words above cited give the printed *Hebrew* Text the same reading as you find in your *Manuscripts*, and that your *Manuscripts* are the same as the *Greek* Version. Now, my reasoning on the point is this. According to your own assertion, the *Masoretic* Notes are Corruptions; if so, they corrupt the printed Text, but, by corrupting it, they make it like your *Manuscripts* and the *Greek* Version; therefore your *Manuscripts* and the *Greek* Version are corrupt; because, when one thing corrupts another, and by corrupting it makes it like a third, the third is necessarily corrupt, for otherwise there would be no likeness between them.

Thirdly. I maintain that great part of the thirty-six words, which you give as examples, are not faults.

For instance, the Verbs which are in the singular instead of the plural, or in the plural instead of the singular, are they so many errors? No, certainly; and if you had the principles of the Language before you and would apply them, you would not reckon them such. It is very strange, that you must destroy the nature of the *Hebrew* Language, and put it on a level with the Western Tongues. But you will say, that the Marginal Notes, your *Manuscripts*, and the *Greek* Version are on your side, and inform you, that these are so many errors. . . And is that all your evidence?

dence? Let me shew you then what stress is to be laid upon it.

First, Who told you that the marginal Notes, by directing a different reading from that of the Text, intend always to announce a fault in the Text? Nothing is farther from the truth; they only serve, three times out of four, to mark the Hebraism, and are a warning to you to beware of it, and understand, or translate, as if the word was in the Text, which they put down in the Margin. Do you think, for example, that when the Text has it in the singular **יאמר** (he said) **ידבר** (he spake) though there were many who said, or spake, and that the marginal Note bids you read **יאמרו**, **ידברו**, *they said, they spake*; do you think, I say, that the Note means, correct the Text, for it is faulty? Not at all; it only directs you to translate, as if it was **יאמרו**, **ידברו**, *they said, they spake*. And it is necessary in this case to understand the genius of the Language, and apply the rules of it, that we may know whether the Note indicates a fault or an Hebraism.

Your Manuscripts, you say, have the same reading as the Corrections in the Marginal Notes: I readily believe it; and it is that which discovers the ignorance of your Transcribers. You may be well assured, that out of the 400 Manuscripts you have already collected, or consulted, there are at least 380 of them which were fabricated from the printed Text. The Transcribers, who understood but little of *Hebrew*, finding in the Text a singular Verb with a plural Nominative, weakly fancied it was a solecism, and taking the Note as a direction to correct it, they substituted the word that was in the Margin for that which was in the Text.

The case is much the same in regard to the *Greek* Version. The Genius of the *Greek* Language is very diffe-

different from that of the *Hebrew*. Would you have had the Translator follow the *Hebrew* word for word, and make as barbarous and unintelligible a Version of it into *Greek*, as *Pagninus* has done into *Latin*? He was obliged in his Translation to conform to the Genius of the Language into which he translated; as you would do to yours, if you were to give an *English* Version; and then he was constrained to divest the *Hebrew* of its Hebraisms, and restore in his *Greek* Version that regularity which the peculiar genius of the *Hebrew* Language seems in its manner of expression to destroy.

When you find a variation in one of your Manuscripts, whether good or bad, it is the same to you; and you make as vehement an outcry about it as if you had discovered the famous *Cock-Lane Ghost*. You magnify it immediately as a Variation of great consequence; and bestow on the printed Text, as a mark of your respect, the Epithet of *Corrupt*. Let us see then if you have so much reason to pique yourself on your discoveries.

It is said in *Leviticus*, Chap. iv. 29.

וַיִּשְׁחַט אֶת חַטָּאתוֹ בַּמָּקוֹם הַזֶּה — *And slay the sin-offering in the place of the burnt-offering.*

A Transcriber, who was exceeding ignorant, thinking that this word, *in the place*, might be ambiguous in *Hebrew*, inserted in his Manuscript *אשר שחט* where he slew; so that the sense of it with this addition is: *he shall slay the sin-offering in the place where he slew the burnt-offering.*

That a meer Englishman should make this addition in his Language is not at all surprising; because the phrase — *in the place of the burnt-offering* — is equivocal, and may denote that the former sacrifice was to be offered *instead* of the latter; but that a man, who sets himself up for the Prince of Hebraists should approve this

this addition, and give it a sanction in the *Hebrew*, under pretence of removing the ambiguity, is very astonishing. You are ignorant then that the *Hebrew* word מקום is not equivocal, that it means a *place*, that is, a space capable of containing a body; and that not one single passage is to be produced from the Bible, wherein it denotes any kind of *substitution* of one thing *instead* of another; and consequently that it can have no other meaning in the Text but—in the place where *he slew*. And so it is that you extol this wretched variation as a VERY REMARKABLE, HAPPILY PRESERVED Reading (Dissert. Vol. I. p. 209.) What suspicions, no way favourable to your Learning and the integrity of your work, do you give occasion for, by lavishing your praises on such trumpery! But to go on with more of it.

The fifth pretended corruption you offer (Vol. II. p. 328) is in these words: ויאמר להם (Judges xv. 11.) *and he said unto them*; whereas one of your Manuscripts reads: ויאמר להם שמעו, *and Sampson said unto them*. If you had examined the passage attentively, you would have seen, that the Children of Judah spake to *Sampson*; and that being alone in the Cave, there was nobody but *him* to answer, and that consequently the repetition of the word *Sampson* was not only useless, but improper, it being mentioned before in the same verse.

In your first Dissertation, p. 25 and 26, you compare the passage in the 1 Chron. xi. 3, where in the printed Text it is, ויכרת להם דוד ברית, *And David made a Covenant with them*, with that in the 2 Samuel, which has וימלך דוד King David. 'Tis probable, you say, that המלך *King* was originally in the Text in Chronicles, because the word is found in a Copy of the Septuagint in the Vatican Library. A pleasant conclusion really: and suppose the word *King* was origi-

originally in the Bible in that place; would the suppression of it in the printed Text be a corruption, or omission of any great importance? Is it not the same to say Lewis the XVth and George the IIIrd, as *King Lewis the XVth and King George the IIIrd*? Look over several subsequent verses in the same books, and you will there find the name *David* frequently mentioned without the Epithet of *King*.

Page 468. of the same Dissertation, you say, that in the second Book of Samuel, Chap. xxiii. 4. our Text has *וַבֹּקֶר בָּקַר יוֹרָח שָׁמֶשׁ*: *And as the light of the morning shall the Sun arise*; and you have found in a Manuscript *יוֹרָח יְהוָה שָׁמֶשׁ*, *Shall JEHOVAH the Sun arise*. Not satisfied with relating such a blunder, you maintain that this word *יהוה* is very properly written in this place. You must explain this passage to us then; for I defy any Scholar to give a rational interpretation to the reading in your Manuscript.

In your second Dissertation, page 187, you tell us, that you have found a Manuscript, which in Exodus, Chap. x. 18. reads *וַיֵּצֵא מֹשֶׁה מֵעַם פָּרְעֹה*: *And Moses went out from Pharaoh*, but that the printed Text does not mention *מֹשֶׁה* (Moses) and only says, *And he went out from Pharaoh*. Indeed you spend the time of the *Public* to very little purpose. The omission of this word is not only no fault in the printed Text; but the addition which your Manuscript makes of it is very improper. The two Brothers were together; if then we would add Nominatives to the Verbs in this verse, we must say, *Moses and Aaron went out from Pharaoh*, and *Moses intreated the Lord*; and for these reasons, 1st. Because, as the two Brothers were together, *Aaron* certainly did not stay after *Moses* was gone; and 2dly. Because, when any miracle was to be wrought, or any plague to cease, it was *Moses* always who intreated the Lord. Read the 16th verse of the same Chapter, and

and particularly the 8th verse in the 8th Chapter of the same book; and you will there find this explanation word for word, it is as clear as the day. If you do not chuse to see, you may blind yourself if you please, you are master of your own eyes, but pray do not put out the eyes of others.

In the Second Book of Samuel, Chap. xiv. 26. we find the word אֶבֶן used to signify a *weight* (a term of traffic); and instead of this word, which also signifies a *stone*, you have found in a Manuscript סֶל which has no other meaning than that of *weight*, and consequently there is a corruption in the printed Text.

Either you were thinking of something else when you put down this word in your List of Corrections, or else you take those for fools who will have the patience to read what you write. Do not you know that the word אֶבֶן signifies both a *stone* and a *weight**? What! have you never read the Holy Scriptures? See then what they say:

Levit. xix. 36. מֵאֵתִי צֶדֶק אֶבֶן צֶדֶק: *Just balances, just weights.*

Deut. xxv. 13. אֶבֶן וְאֶבֶן גְּדוֹלָה וְקטנה: *Divers weights, a great and a small.*

Prov. xi. 1. וְאֶבֶן שְׂלֵמָה רָצוֹנוֹ: *But a just weight is his delight.*

Idem, xvi. 11. כָּל אֶבֶן כֵּיס: *All the weights of the bag.*

Idem, xx. 10. אֶבֶן וְאֶבֶן אֵיפָה וְאֵיפָה: *Divers weights, divers measures.*

* See the word *weight* in Cruden's Concordance; printed at London 1738.

If.

If a *Frenchman* had presented us with this Correction, without being more learned he would have been less culpable; because in his Language the word *pierre* is not used to signify a *weight*: but that an *Englishman* should tell us that the word אבן *stone*, used for *weight*, is an error, surprises me greatly; because in *English* the word means both *stone* and *weight*, and is a common term of traffic in that Nation. STONE, a weight of eight pounds in London, and of twelve in Hereford. A STONE of Wool, or fourteen pounds of Wool. See *Boyer's Dictionary*.

See also *Dilworth's Arithmetick*, or the School-master's Assistant, p. 13.

	lb.
A stone of iron shot is	14
A stone of butcher's meat is	8
A stone of glass is	5
A stone of wool is	14 &c.

But after all, it is wrong to reproach you with such carelessness: every thing is excusable in a man who sets himself up for very learned in *Hebrew*, and yet seems surprised at having found in *Lincoln College* at *Oxford*, a roll of the *Pentateuch*, and another of *Esther*, both without *points*, without the *Masora*, and without distinction of *verses*; for every body knows, that the *Rolls* never have either. You will allow that this declaration which you make (*Dissert. I. p. 334*) is something *beyond* carelessness.

If this is the Doctrine which you intend to distill as the dew, and which, as you make us hope (*Vol. II. the last page*) is to drop upon us like a gracious rain, I crave your favour for the Public: Don't be in haste
to

to open its Cataracts; for if the vapour only is so noxious, what will become of us, should the cloud itself burst over our heads?

I shall confine myself to these few of the many variations you propose; and I believe I have sufficiently shewn the folly and weakness of them: I shall only say farther, First, that of the 12000 Variations you have already found, and which you describe as of *great importance*, there are at least, 11900 of them in the same strain as those which I have just now analysed; and secondly, that besides the 12000 (which you will probably mention in due time and place) there are in your Manuscripts more than 250000, which you will be very careful *not* to mention; because they are nothing but *absurdities, mistakes of ignorance, omissions*, or additions, which are deserving only of contempt and derision. But to proceed.

If you had been content to cite Variations, without pretending to reason on the value of them, the mischief had not been great; but you were resolved to give a Specimen of your Corrections; and it is that which detects you. You thought, no doubt, that, by chusing an obscure passage for the purpose, we should not be able, or should not dare to examine your Reasonings, nor estimate your Corrections; but don't deceive yourself, I will do both, and shew that the latter are as arbitrary and wretched, as the former are false and inconclusive.

The passage in question is the 2d and 3d verses of the xxxiii chapter of Deuteronomy, of which you propose a new reading, in your first Dissertation, p. 422. The reading in our printed Text runs thus.

Ver. 2. ואתה מרבבת קדש מימינו אש דת למו

Ver. 3. אף חבב עמים כל קדשו בדרך והם
תכו לרגלך ישא מדברתיך

H

Literally,

Literally,

Ver. 2. *And he came with ten thousand Saints, (he had) in his right hand a fiery law for them.*

Ver. 3. *Yea, he loved the people; all his Saints are in thy hand, and they sat down at thy feet, he shall receive of thy words.*

I confess that this is not plain to people who have not studied the genius of the *Hebrew Language*: but those who understand it, and are acquainted with the prophetic style, easily see through these obscurities. First of all, we are to keep in remembrance, that it is *Moses*, who here, a few days or perhaps the day before his death, gives to each tribe in particular a prophetic blessing. He begins with reminding the *Israelites*, in few words, of the Majesty of the God they worship, his goodness and loving kindness towards them, and implores his protection for those who shall observe his Laws.

ואתה מרבבת קדש : *And he came with ten thousand Saints.* This describes the glory of the God of Israel, and the splendor of his Court.

מימינו אש דת למו *In his right hand a fiery law for them.* In this is represented his goodness.

אף חבב עמים : *Yea, he loved the people.* This manifests his loving kindness.

כל קדשיו בידך : *All his Saints in thy hand.* This speaks of his protection.

I shall explain only these two verses, because you treat them the worst of the five, having found *five* faults in the *nineteen* words which compose them. Before I give the true meaning, let us see your Corrections, and your reasonings in support of them,

First, you have placed at the end of the first verse *ויאמר*, and he said, which in the printed Text begins the second. I do not charge you with this as a fault, because the transposition is very immaterial, and does
not

not in the least alter the sense. This circumstance only serves to prove your eagerness for correction, right or wrong; for this Verb was full as well, and perhaps better, at the beginning of the second verse, the first being the title of the chapter; but this is a trifle.

You say, (p. 425.) that “ the words מרבבת קדש “ cannot regularly signify *with ten thousands of Saints*; “ because the general senses of מ are *ab* and *absque*; “ and because קדש is not *Saints* but *Holiness*.

I acknowledge that the most common signification of מ is *a* or *ab*, *e* or *ex*, but do these general significations exclude particular ones? Does it the less signify *cum* (with, in Isaiah lvii. 8. ותכרת לך מהם: *Et pepigisti (fœdus) cum eis*: *And thou hast made a covenant with them*? In Ecclef. vii. 10. כי לא מחכמה שאלת: *Quia non cum sapientia interrogasti*: *Because thou hast not asked with wisdom*? Does it signify, *a*, or *ab*, or *de* in the 24th verse of this same chapter, that we are speaking of, where we read, ולאשר אמר ברוך מבנים. And does that mean, *let Ashur be blessed with*, or *from his children*? Consult then the *English* or *Latin* Version.

But, you will tell me, this מ is used three times before in the same verse, and constantly signifies *de* or *ex*, *a* or *ab*: therefore it ought to have the same signification in this place.

First of all, I might deny that this Preposition ought to be rendered by *ex* or *ab* in the three places now mentioned; because it seems to me more proper to say, the Lord came *upon* mount Sinai than *from* mount Sinai, &c. but at present I will allow it may be rendered by *ex* or *ab*: but where then is the necessity of assigning it that signification in a place which will not bear it? You so clearly saw the impossibility of it, that you were forced to alter the Text, and substitute the name of a place for the two words (מרבבת קדש)

which signify *with ten thousand Saints*. And you accomplish it; first, by changing the word מרבבת, which by means of the כּ signifies, *with ten thousand*, into that of מריבת (*Meribath*) which is the name of a place. Secondly, By giving the word קדש *Saint*, the signification of *Kadesh*, which is another name of place; so that instead of rendering it agreeable to the Text: *He came with ten thousand Saints*, you render it, *He came from Meribath-kadesh*. I cannot tell what reason you have for giving a Translation so contrary to the Text, and to good sense; but this I know, that it is moreover a violation of the rules of Grammar; because the כּ of מריבת is formative, and you will always find this place, whether in the Pentateuch, the Psalms, or Ezekiel, called *Meribah*. But if this כּ is formative, it is no longer a Preposition, and why then do you translate it as if it were? You must add another כּ before that which is formative, or else, if you would have it dispensed with, you must not discredit the different significations of this Preposition.

As we are upon the general significations of Prepositions, and you seem to oppose the giving to them such extensive meanings as Sense, Reason, and the connection of the Sentiments require, I will shew you a striking instance of the necessity of doing this.

St Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans, chap. i. ver. 4. speaking of *Jesus Christ*, says, Τῷ ὁρισθέντος υἱῷ Θεῷ ἐν δυνάμει, κατὰ πνεῦμα αἰγιωσινης, ἐκ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν.

There is no doubt but the general signification of these three Prepositions is, ἐν, *in*, IN; κατὰ, *secundum*, ACCORDING TO; ἐκ or ἐξ, *ab* or *ex*, BY OR FROM. And consequently, upon your principle, it should be translated, *In potentia secundum spiritum sanctitatis ex resurrectione mortuorum*: IN POWER ACCORDING TO THE SPIRIT OF HOLINESS BY THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD. You will allow, that this Version is unintelligible

telligible : and I defy you, if you give these Prepositions only their general signification, to explain to us what St. Paul means. But let us construe them with that latitude which they require, and the whole will be clear.

The scope of this Apostle, in writing to the Romans, was to prove, in his introduction, the divinity of Jesus Christ. Thus, after having said that he was made of the seed of David, according to the flesh, *ex semine David secundum carnem*, he adds, τὸ ὁρισθέντος ὑἱὸς Θεοῦ, which does not here mean, *prædestinatus*, predestinated, as it is usually rendered ; but *statutus*, *definitus*, who was declared, acknowledged, which is the true signification of the Verb ὁρίζομαι, to be the Son of God. Now he was declared to be the Son of God by three irrefragable proofs of Divinity.

Εν δυνάμει ; by his power, which made all nature tremble, and subdued it to his laws.

Κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης : by the spirit of holiness which dwelt in him.

Εξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν : by his resurrection from the dead. These are the three signs by which Jesus Christ was, and is declared to be the Son of God : and this may demonstrate to you how very absurd it frequently must be to confine the prepositions to their general signification ; because by so doing Translations are made unintelligible, and the true meaning of the Holy Scriptures not understood.

But to return to your work.

You say, that the word קדש has no other meaning except that of holiness. Why do the sacred Writers then make use of it to express that of holy ?

Exodus xxxvi. 33. בין הקדש ובין קדש הקדשים : Between the Holy, and the Holy of Holies.

H 3

That

That of *Sanctuary*? Daniel viii. 13. וקדש : and the *Sanctuary*.

מימינו אש-דת למו : *In his right hand a fiery law for them.* As you did not understand the meaning of this, you have made a new reading. But whether a more intelligible one let the candid determine, when I have laid it before them.

You first attack the word דת ; and you say (p. 247.) “ this word is *Chaldee* ; and is not found in any book “ before the Captivity but in this place, &c.”

May be so ; but is it therefore the less *Hebrew* ? If it were not *Hebrew*, would it be found in the same place and in the same sense in the *Samaritan Pentateuch* ? And would you have met with it in your *Samaritan Manuscripts* ? For I trouble myself very little about No. I, “ reading דות, and No. L. having “ placed the ו over the word, as if it had been “ omitted.” It is sufficient for me, that the two radicals ד and ת are there. Now you know very well that the *Samaritans* never wrote any book after the Captivity.

Besides, why then did you not likewise dispute the origin of the Verb אתה *he came*, which is in the same verse ? For it is at least as much *Chaldee* as דת ; but thus it is you discover your partiality ; when a word is troublesome, and will not bend to your fancy, you quarrel with it about it's birth, it's native country, and it's signification. On the contrary, when they are conformable to your conceits, let them be ever so spurious, or doubtful as to their origin, you *legitimate* them, and assign them a noble pedigree.

Secondly, This word (you say) “ is here used very “ obscurely, because it follows אש fire—and farther, “ the proper word for the law is תורה.”

If I wanted any additional evidence to convince me that you understand *Hebrew* very superficially, and
have

have but an imperfect knowledge of the Genius of the Language, I would put these two reasons down to the account. דת cannot here signify *law*, because it is joined to the word אש fire. Do not you know then, that fire, in Holy Scripture, is the Symbol of the Divinity ?

THAT THE LORD IS SURROUNDED WITH IT.

Exodus xix. 18. ויהר סיני עשן כלו מפני
אשר ירד עליו יהוה באש

And mount Sinai was altogether on a smoke, because the Lord descended upon it in fire.

THAT GOD IS HIMSELF A CONSUMING FIRE.

Deut. iv. 24. כי יהוה אלהיך אש אכלה הוא
For the Lord thy God is a consuming Fire

THAT HIS WORDS ARE LIKE AS OF FIRE.

Jeremiah xxiii. 29. הלא כה דברי כאש נאם יהוה :
Are not my words like as a fire, saith the Lord.

THAT HE SPEAKS OUT OF THE MIDST OF THE FIRE.

Deut. iv. 22. וידבר יהוה אליכם מתוך האש :
And the Lord spake to you out of the midst of the Fire.
Idem, ver. 15, &c. &c.

And would not you have the covenant which God makes with his people, and the commandments he gives them, partake of the element under which himself appears, speaks, and acts ? What obscurity, what contradiction then do you find in the idea which this

expression of a *fiery law* suggests? You have no conception of the sublimity and force of scriptural terms. If the Lord said to Jeremiah, chap. v. 14. *I will make my words in thy mouth fire*; with much greater reason may those which he utters himself, and the law which he gives out of the midst of an appearance the most glorious and terrible, be called *words*, or a *law of fire*.

“The proper word for *law* is תורה.” Yes, the generical word for *law*: and under this *Hebrew* Substantive is comprized the whole body of laws given by *Moses*, whether ceremonial, moral, or judicial; and in short the Pentateuch, which frequently has no other title than this. But was it the Pentateuch which the Lord had in his right hand, when he descended on mount *Sinai*, which he rehearsed to all *Israel* trembling, and which he gave to *Moses* written with his own hand on two tables of stone? No, certainly, it was the *ten Commandments* or the Decalogue, to which the sacred Penman rightly gave the name of דבר, which signifies an *Edict*, a *Decree*, an *Ordinance*, rather than that of תורה, which was too general a term to be used here. Could he have given the Decalogue an epithet more *sublime*, *energetic*, and *powerful* than that of a *fiery decree*? And in fact is it not a *consuming fire* to those who observe not it's laws?

After having done your best to invalidate a passage which you do not understand, you substitute for it a Version which makes no sense, or at least a very absurd one. Thus you explain yourself, p. 430, “Amidst the uncommon confusion of Interpreters and Commentators, the *Samaritan* Version alone seems to have preserved it. For that Version which in general exactly expresses the words of the Text reads the line here לוק אורה נור.—So that the first word “being the same as in the *Hebrew*”————

Stop,

Stop, Sir, a little, for this is not strictly true. I have already censured you on that account in my first Letter. The *Hebrew* reads מִיְמִינוֹ in *his right hand* in the Masculine; and your Version has מִיְמִינָה in the Feminine, without one's being able to guess to what this Feminine Affix refers. Why then do you impose upon us?

The second word is נֹר, which signifies in *Hebrew* a *Lanthorn*, and in *Chaldee*, *Fire*. Take which you will of them.

The third is אֹרֶה the meaning of which is *Light*.

Lastly, the fourth is לֹךְ, which signifies to *lodge*.

So that joining these four words together, I find the meaning of the Passage to be, *she lodges in her right hand a LANTHORN or a Fire of LIGHT*. The *Samaritan* Version has therein preserved a fine idea truly. I congratulate you upon it, and particularly on the value of your discovery.

But if this Version expresses so exactly the words of the Text, why did you not render them all? You have taken only one of them for your new Version, and that not entirely; for the *Samaritan* has אֹרֶה in the Feminine, and you only mention אֹר; and what is best of all, your Version is not the clearer for it; since it presents to us only *a fire of light, or luminous fire in the right hand of the Lord*. So that notwithstanding all your endeavours to prove the word דֹּת of your Manuscripts to be derived from אֹר, because both have a ך between the two letters; and that א and ך were corrupted and changed into ד and ת, I shall still think and maintain that your two Manuscripts, the *Samaritan* Version, and your reasonings, are all equally bad; and that you divest the Text of the most sublime idea, and energetic expression, to substitute in it's stead a Version as absurd as it is unintelligible.

At

At page 431, you present us with another Correction. The reading of the Text is כל קדשיו בידך : *All his Saints are in thy hand*, and you correct it by וכל קדשיו ברך. *And he blessed all his Saints*. You reason upon it in this manner.

“ This reading of ברך instead of בידך is a very “ small variation as to the letters.”

It is true, it is only just to make the י vanish, and change ד into ר, which is a meer trifle.

“ But it makes a great improvement in the sense of “ the line. . . . This reading is confirmed by the “ Samaritan Version, which has בארך, which cannot “ signify *in manu tua*, in thy hand, but seems to be “ ברך with the addition of א to express the *Kametz*, “ and a ד for a ר.”

If the Samaritan word בארך cannot signify *in thy hand* (which is true) tell us then what it can signify ; for I defy any one to make sense of it, since it is not of any Language. But, you say, “ it stands here for ברך, “ he blessed ; the א is to be looked upon as a letter “ put to express the *Kametz*, and ד for ר.” Really that is not difficult ; but do you forget then ; First, that you have proscribed the points ; that the Samaritans never knew them, nor made use of them, as you allow in your second Dissertation, p 305 : and will you have it that they inserted an א to express the *Kametz* ? I challenge you to shew any Hebrew Bible where ברך *he blessed*, is to be found with an א to express a *Kametz*. Secondly, That you were correcting the printed Hebrew Text by the Samaritan Version : and are you obliged to correct the Samaritan Version likewise ? Give us then better records, or at least look for some that will not want your Correction. For nothing is more disgusting than to see you condemn without reason a word in the printed Text ; and when we expect to find it replaced by a better, which you declare

declare to be more intelligible and consistent, to be surprized with the appearance of another, which you have been forced to botch in order to give it a meaning. Indeed this is downright making sport of your Readers.

The three last Corrections consist in your changing the ך at the end of דברתיך and רנלך, which denote the second person, *thy foot, thy words*, and putting the Verb in the Plural (ישא) which is in the Singular in the printed Text (ישא).

I shall content myself with repeating to you on this head what I said in a former Letter, that before we pretend to correct a Text, and especially one so important as that of Holy Scripture, we should understand perfectly the Language in which it is written; be thoroughly acquainted with it's nature, have the principles of it constantly before our eyes, make the most exact application of them, and more particularly not annihilate words when they speak contrary to what we would have them, as you have done in the fourth verse of this Chapter, where you have suppressed the name of *Moses*, which occurs there. But this artifice is easily seen through, and you may depend upon it I shall set it in it's proper light some other time, as well as many others, about which I say nothing at present.

If you had observed this method; if you had recollected that the *Hebrew* often uses a certain for an uncertain number; that frequently the Substantives are Plural, and the Adjectives or Pronouns which relate to them Singular; that the Prophet often passes from one person to another without any intimation of such a change, &c. you would not have taken so much pains to put a wrong construction on the words of *Moses*, and find faults which never existed. Nothing more was necessary than to apply the principles, which you never did, and assuredly never will do;
because

because it would entirely demolish the building, which you want to erect upon the ruins of the printed Text, or more properly, of the *Hebrew Language*. And indeed, what would your Subscribers say, if you were to make a recantation? They expect from your penetration thirty or forty thousand gross faults in the printed *Hebrew Text* of the Holy Scripture; and you must find them there at all events, or else return them their money; there is no other way left.

As I have not the same game to play, and as no interest whatever shall at any time make me conceal or invent any fault in the sacred Text, I will now give you an explanation of these two verses. To find the true meaning of them, all that is requisite is to divest them of the Hebraisms in which they are involved.

ואתה מרבבת קדש: *And he came with ten thousand Saints. Ten thousand* is here put for the indefinite number. I will mention only one example of it.

Psal. xci. 7. יפל מצדך אלף ורבבה מימין: *A thousand shall fall at thy side, and ten thousand at thy right hand.* This is a common idiom in the *Hebrew*.

מימין אש דת למו: *In his right hand a fire of law for them. A fire of law, for, a law of fire, or fiery law: an Hebraism.*

For them, that is, for the Children of *Israel*, spoken of in the former verse. It is to be observed that the Pronoun is to be accompanied with a paragogic *kolem*, which ought to be expressed.

אהב עמים: *Yea, loving the people.* This word people in the Plural does not embarrass a man who understands *Hebrew*. He has before seen, that *Abraham, Ismael, Joseph, and Aaron* after their deaths were gathered, *ad populos suos*, to their people. It is a Plural for a Singular, and here signifies the people of *Israel*.

כל קדשיו בידך. *All his Saints in thy hand.*

First,

First, The Pronoun Affix γ does not relate to the Lord, it is the Saints of the people of *Israel* that the Prophet is speaking of; and it is this Pronoun Singular which distinctly indicates, that under the plural word *the people*, we are to understand *people* in the Singular. Secondly, It's application is determined by the Pronoun Affix of the second person γ , *tua, thy*, which occurs three times in this verse, and which you have mistaken for three faults; because you thought, that *ejus, his*, related to the Lord. Thirdly, This expression *to be in the hand of any one*, signifies *to be protected by him, to be blessed with his favour*.

תָּבוּ לְרַגְלֶךָ, literally, *Collocentur ad pedem tuum*: *Let them be placed at thy foot, for, at thy feet*. It is a singular for a plural Substantive.

יֵשָׁא מִדְּבָרְתֶּךָ. *Let him receive of thy words*. This is an enallage of number, a singular Verb for a plural. There are examples of it without end.

Now, what is the result of your imaginary corrections, but a strange Version, which has no relation to what *Moses* means?

Whereas the result of my application of the principles of the language to these two Verses is a sense clear, intelligible, and intimately connected with what precedes and follows.

This is your's, conformable to your Corrections.

Ver. 2. *Æternus de Sinai venit.*

.....
Et Venit Meribath Kades,
In dextra ejus ignis luminis ipsius.

Ver. 3. Etiam diligit populos,
Et omnes sanctos suos benedicit;
Et ipsi collocantur ad pedes ejus,
Et accipiunt de verbis ejus.

Ver. 2.

Ver. 2. JEHOVAH came from Sinai.

.....
And he came from Meribah Kadesh.
In his right hand a lanthorn of light for them.

Ver. 3. Truly he loves the people,
And blesses all his Saints :
And they place themselves at his feet,
And they receive of his words.

Mine, divested of it's Hebraisms, runs thus.

Ver. 2. *Æternus venit in Sinai.*

.....
*Venit cum decem millibus sanctis :
In dextera ejus ignea lex ipsis.*

Ver. 3. *Certe (tu) diligens populum.
(Sint) omnes sancti ejus in manu tuâ ;
Conjunganur ipsi pedibus tuis,
Et accipiant verba tua.*

Ver. 2. The Lord came down upon mount Sinai.
He descended encompassed
With an innumerable host of holy spirits :
In his right hand he brought
A fiery law for the children of Israel.

Ver. 3. Yea (Lord) thou lovest the people :
Bless with thy favour
Those who are faithful to thy laws,
And continually prostrate at thy feet
Let them there receive thy Oracles.

I will leave the unprejudiced Christian Hebraist to determine which of the two Versions is the most consistent, the most spirited, and best connected.

Indeed mine is made from the printed Text, alone, involved in Hebraisms ; and your's from 450 Manuscripts. The match does not seem very equal, but the scene

scene at mount Carmel comforts me. *Elijah* stood
single against 450 Prophets of *Baal*, and he neverthe-
less came off victorious. Take my word for it, your
450 Parchments will succeed no better against the
printed Text, than *Baal's* Prophets against *Elijah*.

I have the honour to be, &c.

LETTER

L E T T E R V.

S I R,

ONE thing, which struck me very much, when I began reading your Dissertations, was the acknowledgment you make (Vol. I. p. 11.) in these words—"For whose satisfaction (the satisfaction of good men) and in Justice to the present Text, it must be (and is here with pleasure) observed—that the many Variations and Errors, which do in fact occur, are chiefly found in places not immediately relative to the *Faith* or *Practice* of mankind, &c."

At the sight of these words, I reasoned with myself in the same manner as I suppose any body else would have done. If the great Articles of the *Christian Faith* are secured to us in the present Text, to what purpose is it to trouble the Church with Corrections and Innovations, which are no way serviceable to Religion? What benefit, what advantage can accrue to *Christians* from knowing that in some places יעקב is written with a ך, and in others יעקב without a ך; that before the Captivity נד was written without a ך, and after it with a ך, &c. Was *Jesus Christ* therefore ever the less incarnate? Did he at all the less shed his blood for us? Or is he for that reason not risen from the dead? I satisfied myself therefore at first with looking on your Work as merely useless; but you did not leave me long under that mistake. As soon as you

you thought your Reader sufficiently lulled asleep by this declaration, and by your tedious parallel between some passages in the books of Chronicles and of Kings, whose Variations are really nothing more than wretched trifles, you fall all at once on a Passage in the 10th verse of the xvth Psalm, relating to no less a point than the Resurrection of *Jefus Christ*. It is true, that at page 218, this Error is only mentioned as it were by accident; but you resume it again at page 498, and you handle it so tragically that one cannot help laughing at your lamentations. However, as the passage treats of an article of faith, or to speak more properly, of the mystery on which the very being of Christianity depends, I am obliged publicly to expose the inconsistency and contradiction of your reasonings on this subject. The words in dispute are,

Psalm xvi. 10. לא תתן חסידך לראות שהת, which are always translated, *thou wilt not suffer thy HOLY ONE to see corruption*. Words, which in all ages have been understood of *Jefus Christ* in the Grave, and with so much the more reason, as he is the one and only subject of the Psalm.

It was never thought of till now, to raise an outcry against the word חסידך, and look upon it as an impious one, because there was a second י between the ך and the ך, which might give it the interpretation of thy *holy Ones* in the Plural instead of thy *holy One* in the Singular. People candidly referred it to the unanimous opinion of Commentators and Interpreters, to all the ancient Versions, and even to the interlineary ones, which are the most scrupulous, though at the expence of good sense, to render every word literally, and which have all translated it in the Singular, *thy holy One*; but you do not move in the common sphere; this, in your opinion, is a monster, which (had it not

such a champion as you to encounter and destroy it) would swallow up the Religion of *Jesus Christ*. What acknowledgement is due to you from every *Christian* ! What pen is worthy to celebrate your exploits ! Let us try at least to recount them.

You begin with declaring point blank, (p. 218.) that “ the strong reasoning of the Apostles, St. *Peter* “ and St. *Paul* is invalidated by the *improper insertion* “ of this same Letter ” These are your own words ; and indeed they are *bitter words*.

It is very certain that St. *Peter* and St. *Paul* have quoted this Passage as a proof of the Resurrection of *Jesus Christ*, and that both of them have rendered the word *הוא* by the Singular, *thy holy One*, and have proved beyond a doubt, that this expression was applicable to none but *Jesus Christ* alone. Whether this which occasions you so much uneasiness was, or was not, in their Copy, I cannot tell ; but it is certain they have rendered the word by the Singular ; and for a man to come at the end of 1800 years, and declare that this title invalidates the strong reasoning of the Apostles, is like attempting to make the Public believe, that a Fly might overturn the Tower of *London* : it is watering Scepticism to increase the growth of it : it is—you constrain me to tell you so, it is destroying with your own hands a main foundation of the *Christian* Religion.

If a *Jew* were to reason in the manner you do, I should not be surpris'd ; because he never turns aside the veil that is before his eyes, except to look with favourable prejudice on every thing that he thinks may serve to weaken, to lessen, to destroy the Divinity of *Jesus Christ*. But that a Doctor, who pretends to be a *Christian*, and a learned Hebraist, who begins with declaring publicly, that the numberless faults in the printed Text are chiefly found in places
not

not immediately relative to faith, and says at the same time, that he observes it *with pleasure*; that such an one should a few pages after present his Reader on a sudden with a corruption of a word which seems to him to *invalidate* the proof of one of the most essential articles of the *Christian Faith*, this is what shocks one, and discovers the evil tendency of the work. But perhaps my fears are groundless, a suspicious phrase may escape the most able Writer. Let us see then the sequel of your reasonings on this subject.

You say, (p. 499, of your first Dissertation) that "the Manuscripts, which happily discover this important reading (that is חסידך instead of חסידך) are "No. II, III, &c."

Any one who reads your Work, with unsuspecting candour, would be tempted to believe that he should have lived and died ignorant of that *important reading*, had not your Manuscripts *happily discovered* it to him. How great then must be his surprise when he finds that Dr. *Rutherford*, Professor at *Cambridge*, mentioned to you in his Letter *twenty printed Editions* (probably there are more of them) where the same reading occurs as in your choice Manuscripts! Either you did know this anecdote, or you did not; if you did, you should have owned it, and not have satisfied yourself with abruptly mentioning only one of them (*Robert Stephens's*), as if you were ashamed of finding it agree with your Copies; you should remember, let me tell you, that to speak against the truth, or to conceal it, is equally a crime in a Corrector of the sacred Writings. If you did not know it, you should have informed yourself of it before you published your reflections; you should have examined carefully, whether the word חסידך with a second י was really a corruption, and not have determined it, till you had indisputable proofs of it; much less should you have

made such tragical exclamations about it, as if there had been but one single Copy of the Creed left in the whole world, and a wild *Indian* had run away with it into the woods.

But you say, p. 498, "to determine that the word *חסדיך* is corrupted, to apostolical authority may be first added the authority of all the ancient Versions."

So then, now it is the authority of the Apostles and ancient Versions which set aside *חסדיך*, and not this word which invalidates the reasoning of the Apostles. This is what you should have said at first, at p. 218, and not imprudently have blurted it out, that the corruption of this word destroyed the reasoning of the Apostles. Do not you perceive that you are opening a new door to impiety, that all our Infidels will for the future make a bad use of your words, and only give for answer to those who would discourse with them on the Resurrection of the incarnate word, that it is entirely overthrown by the corruption of this passage; that a learned Doctor said so, and they will abide by his opinion? Are you ignorant, that these wiflings never read any of the Works which combat their frenzy, but greedily swallow down the wildest absurdities when analogous to their impiety? You may be sure you will soon be quoted in their writings. What a misfortune that *Abbé Bazin de Fernai* did not know this anecdote sooner! he certainly would have taken advantage of it.

"—Secondly, The authority of the Masorets themselves, who (though they have ordered the word to be printed Plural in the Text) have ordered it to be read Singular."

The better to unravel this reasoning, (which by the Parenthesis does not seem very clear) let us go back a moment

moment to our principles, and apply them to your opinions.

I gave you at the beginning of my fourth Letter, an explanation of the Masoretic Notes, the mark of which is a small Circle (°) put over the letter of the Text; I added, that these small Circles did not always indicate a fault in the Text, but were very often intended only to give notice of the Hebraism, and that the word marked in the Text was to be understood as it stood in the Margin divested of its Hebraism. These are principles which I defy you to destroy.

But you on the contrary have been very careful to proclaim the Masoretic Notes as Corruptions; and it did not surprise me; for I saw clearly from the first pages of your Work that you were determined at all events to find faults without number in the printed Text. It was very natural therefore that you should declare war against the Notes, which sometimes correct it; because by admitting their validity you would render all your Manuscripts useless, as they *most commonly* have in their Text what is in the Margin of the printed one; but your indignation against those Notes is not well supported, as I will now shew.

You were of opinion, when you wrote your first Dissertation (p. 21.) that the Hebrew name of David was always written without a י (דוד) before the Captivity, and with a י (דודי) after it. Pray, let me ask you, before we go any farther, whether this is not cavilling about nothing, and endeavouring to swell a volume with impertinent trifles; for of what use can the discussion of such points be? I had rather an hundred times read the History of the two Parties, which went to war with one another, in order to decide at which end they should break their eggs; I learn at least from *Gulliver's* diverting Travels, that, the *Big-Endians* having been routed, one is to break one's egg at the

little end. But in your work — well, it is no great matter, in we are, and on we must.

But you have found an instance in the Prophet *Amos*, who certainly lived before the captivity, and yet wrote (דויד) *David* with a ך (Hosea had done the same, Chap. iii. 5.) How then do you contrive to support your assertion? Why, singularly enough. You turn over all the printed Bibles; at last you find in the Edition of *Venice* the ך with the Masoretic Circle, which denotes (you say) *an Error in the Text*; for in the margin it is דויד. But is this being consistent with yourself? What! do you reject with scorn the Masoretic Notes as Corruptions, when they clear up the meaning of the Text, and admit their validity when they countenance your pretended Corrections? And why then did you not likewise inform your Readers, that this *same Masoretic Circle* was over the second ך in all the printed Editions which have חסיד׳ך, and particularly in *Van-der-Hooght's*, with which you collate all your Manuscripts? Why has it not the same power over the ך in חסיד׳ך as in דויד? Plainly, because it was your interest to object a corruption of great importance, and raise the Character of your Manuscripts which *happily* discovered it. For if you had fairly told us: There is in the 16th Psalm an important word, which might have a bad interpretation put upon it, if the second ך was left standing where it is; but it has the Masoretic Circle, and it is written in the Margin as it ought to be read; we should immediately have replied, We have no occasion then for your Manuscripts, nor your Work; as the Text corrects itself; that is sufficient.

But this is not all, you not only concealed the note, which served to explain the word, but you endeavour to make the Masora ridiculous. "This rule (you say

" say Vol. II. p. 469.) commands **הַסִּידִד** *thy holy One* " to be written **הַסִּידִיד** *thy saints*," and you said (Vol. I. p. 498.) that " though the Masorets have ordered the word to be *printed plural in the Text*, they have " ordered it to be read singular". Is it in derision or through inattention that you impose upon us such a contradictory order? Is it to inform us that the Masora *has* and *has not* corrected the passage at the same time? Or rather is it not an attempt of yours to father on the Masora the contradictions of your own making, in order to extricate yourself from the difficulty you are got into by this note, which overturns all your reasonings. Do not be disturbed; I must clear up your Ideas for you; though fore against your will. Yes, Sir, you speak more to the purpose than you intend, as I shall now undertake to shew.

I acknowledge, and it is *with pleasure* too, that the Masora has ordered **הַסִּידִיד** to be printed in the Text; and a better proof cannot be adduced, that the word is not corrupted; because it would be repugnant to good sense to order a corrupt word to be written, and at the same time direct it to be read otherwise. But as the word, though right, is capable of a wrong interpretation, the Masorets at the same time that they order it to be written as probably it always was, have given the true signification of it in the Margin.

Yes, undoubtedly, it ought to be **הַסִּידִיד**, and the second *is not* a corruption of the word. But, you say, that when so written, it denotes the plural, *thy saints*, whereas the word should be in the singular, *thy holy one*. And who told you that the *in this place* is the sign of the plural? are you ignorant that there are a multitude of words in the Holy Scripture, to which the *is* annexed only to give them an additional force? And is there any word more worthy to be so distinguished

guished than that which serves to point out Jesus Christ incarnate ?

You may find Examples of it in my third Letter. Are you ignorant, that, agreeable to an ancient custom of the Language, the *◌* is used to denote the *sheva*, that is to say, the (*e*) mute which characterises the singular ? See *Robertson, Dom. Guarin, &c.* they will shew it you. Are you ignorant, that, among all the Bibles printed with points, there is not one which, notwithstanding the *◌*, has not pointed this word as singular ? Open the first Bible you meet with and see if there is not a *sheva* under the *◌*. Are you, in short, ignorant, that the Jews themselves read it in the *singular*, notwithstanding the *◌* ? See their own Bible, and their Book of *Prayers* printed at *Metz* in *Lorraine* in the year 1765, by a *Jew*, for *Joseph Anthony*, Printer in Ordinary to the King, where the Author has taken the precaution to put the *Masoretic Note* in the Text itself, immediately after the word *◌* with the Circle over the *◌*. But I will go farther, and say, that supposing it true, that the second *◌* did denote the plural, yet it would not be an Error. Are you ignorant then that the *Hebrew* plural is often used instead of the singular to express the importance or excellence of the Substantive in question ? And is not Jesus Christ *the Holy One* by way of eminence ? In a word, to prove that the second *◌* is not a Corruption, I have on my side the Genius of the Language, the dignity of the Subject treated of, the reasoning of the Apostles, the consent of the Church, the confession of the greatest Enemies of Jesus Christ, and the concurrent testimony of Interpreters, Commentators, and all the Versions which, though they read this word with the second *◌*, for it seems never to have been without it, have yet always rendered it by the singular ; and you, in support of your

your opinion that it is a Corruption, have no evidence but your own prepossession, and a fatal longing after finding faults by thousands in the printed Text. Depend upon it, if some Bibles suppressed the second, it was always through precaution only, and to obviate any abuse that might be made of it. Was it of a Christian Doctor there was so much reason to be mistrustful? And is it by so eagerly catching at the Phantom of an Error, which exists only in your own imagination, that you intend to prove to us the necessity of correcting the printed Text? Make a better use of your time, Sir, or at least do not begin by amusing us with a declaration that the many Errors which do in fact occur are chiefly found in places not immediately relative to the *faith* or *practice* of mankind. For nothing can be more opposite than your words and your conduct. The former seem intended only to lull the Public asleep, that they may not suspect the rashness of your undertaking; and by the latter you openly wage war against a word which relates immediately to one of the *fundamental* Articles of *Faith*.

If you had shewn at least, a little more diffidence in your performance, I might perhaps have overlooked your contradictions, for I am not maliciously disposed; besides some will unavoidably escape a man in a work of that nature and importance, especially if he is not fully acquainted with the rules of his Art. But you speak with authority, you deliver Oracles, you act the Prophet; and that it is, which provokes me.

“ If the happiness or misery of mankind (say you Vol. II. p. 579.) be necessarily connected with their obedience or disobedience to the will of the Almighty, what great care should be taken that the *Will of the Almighty* when proclaimed from heaven be accurately preserved in the words of the Original? —

“ Cer-

“Certainly the most solid judgment, the most master-ly skill, and the most sacred regard to truth, should conjointly be applied in freeing *Holy Scriptures* from every mistake of Transcribers and Printers, &c.”

When you thus set before us the necessary qualifications of a man, who would restore the original Text to its ancient purity, do you forget that it is yourself who undertake the work? You had better have said at once: Look on me, Gentlemen, and know who I am; I am Doctor *Kennicott*, I am endowed with the best judgment in the world, my knowledge is not to be equalled, and you will never hear me say a single word but with the most sacred regard to truth. Your Bravado would have been laughed at.

You give us another uncommon proof of your diffidence; (Vol. II. p. 6.) “The absolute authenticity of the printed Text of the New Testament has been given up (you say) for some years. The various readings have been published. The learned world has been instructed, &c.”

I know that Dr. *Mill* published a bulky *Greek Testament in Folio*, with a large collection of various readings in the margin, very few of which make any difference in the sense. But where did you learn that his work has occasioned the printed *Greek Text* to be given up? And in what farther degree of knowledge has the learned world been instructed? I know of none, except it be in a knack of despising the Text. Any one may see with half an eye, that the praises you bestow on Dr. *Mill's* undertaking are intended for your own; for you are doing exactly the same with the *Hebrew*, which he did with the *Greek*. You are very careful therefore to insinuate to your Reader, that “the same principles of reason and good sense which have been allowed to cultivate sacred *Criticism* on this second Volume of Revelation must be admitted as to the first

“first Volume of Revelation likewise.” You approve Dr. Mill’s publication of the various readings of the New Testament, that your own of the Old may be approved likewise. Imitate then at least your Original; he, more modest than you, was content to put the various readings in the Margin, and left the Text as he found it; but your Scheme is to make a new Bible; that is, you are to mix up together the interpretations of *Father Houbigant*, the Conjectures of the *Abbé L’Avocat*, the absurdities of your Manuscripts, and your own Conceits; and to this composition you will give the venerable name of the Original Word of God. Infidels will then be all converted without doubt, and the *English Nation* under the auspices of your improvements will be a *wise and understanding people*. “Yes” (say you Vol. II. last page) when the Sentences, “Words, and Letters, now taken from the sacred Hebrew Volume shall be restored, then

“*It’s doctrine shall drop as the rain;*

“*The rough places shall be made plain;*

“*The Glory of the Lord shall be revealed,*

“*And all flesh shall see it together.*”

I have heard much of vain boasting in my time, but I never met with any thing equal to this. How dare you apply to yourself in this manner these words of *Isaiah*? What! will not those salutary effects, which the Holy Scripture imputes to its own Doctrines, begin to take place, till your *new Edition* shall be ushered into the world? Do you speak seriously? Are you in earnest, when you say that the Doctrine of the Old Testament shall then drop as the rain, which implies that it does not *now*, under the present state of the Text? I cannot believe it; Such arrogance would be the madness of impiety.

But

: But when will this great Work appear? That is an hard question. You required only ten years of your Subscribers for finishing it, but you prudently added: Provided the Subscription be large enough.

In regard to the term of ten years, it is certainly too short. Therefore I earnestly advise you to solicit your Subscribers for another ten years; that you may have time to put the finishing stroke to your undertaking. They had rather wait ten or twenty years longer, if necessary, and, be sure of the work at last. Only put out now and then some little fugitive pieces like your Dissertations, or a few explanations of difficult passages as elaborate as those of the second and third verses of the 33d Chapter of *Deuteronomy*; which will serve to shew them at least, that the work is in forwardness, and then they will have patience.

“ Provided (say you) that the Subscription be large enough &c.”—And—“ *For, large as the Subscription is, it will by no means be thought so large, as to employ learned Men, in all parts, to collate all the Manuscripts that are worth collating.*” State of Collations 1762.

The largeness of the Subscription, the employment of learned Men, and the Manuscripts that are worth collating—these are three points, on which I cannot, in conscience, forbear speaking a few words.

As to Subscriptions; I think you should be content with the list you are so fond of presenting to the Public at the end of every State of your Collations; and the more especially as I suspect there would be a great deduction, if you were to give a State of the expences you make such a bustle about for the employment of learned Men. Never put down Mr. *L'Avocat* in the account, for neither he, nor the *young Men* he employed for you, ever took any gratuity for their trouble. However, as it is possible you may not be satisfied

fied with the number of Subscriptions, I will point you out an excellent resource. Let there be a Box put up in all the Churches in *England*, and particularly at *Totness in Devonshire*, with this Inscription—
A BOX FOR THE REPAIRS OF THE PRINTED HEBREW TEXT. Depend upon it, you would find your account in it.

The employment of learned men is an affair of a more delicate nature. I shall begin with observing on this point that I have nothing to say against the learning or abilities of the persons, whose Letters you quote in your State of Collations, or of those who have been serviceable to you in Foreign Courts. I honour them most sincerely, and I hope they will believe me when I say so. My business is with the learned Men you have about you; and as I love regularity, we will step a little way back to begin our enquiry after them.

In the state of the Collation for the year 1762, you tell us, that “*five* OR *six* assistants were engaged in your work, for the sake of greater expedition.”

An ill natured man would cavil with you about that disjunctive Particle OR; for you certainly ought to know the number of your assistants.

But what says your Censor Dr. Hunt? First, *That you had made a very competent progress in your work, and indeed advanced farther than could be expected.* Secondly, *That the Collation having been laid before him, to examine it, he had there found some readings which would be of considerable service to sacred Literature.*

As to the first part of his approbation, I allow, that between *five* OR *six* assistants, and *yourself*, who probably made the *seventh*, you collated in one year near 100130 Verses. The following is a proof of it.

MANUSCRIPTS.

MANUSCRIPTS.		VERSES.
Cambridge public Library	No. 68. Bible	23099
	69. Joshua and Kings	4314
	70. Isaiah to Malachi	4983
	71. Part of Hagiographa	3751
	72. Proph. and Hagi	16255
Caius College.	73. One Bible in three great Vols.	23099
Emanuel College	74. Psalms	1527
Trinity College	Mr. Meerman's Bible in two very great Volumes	23099
Sum total of Verses		100127

This makes about 48 Verses a day for each Workman, and I confess it is a great deal for people to do, whom you were obliged at the same time to teach to read *Hebrew* and *Samaritan*. But what surprizes me is, that Dr. *Hunt* did not add in his approbation of 1764, the clause—*And indeed more than could have been expected*. For in 1764, you collated 19 Manuscripts, containing 116000 Verses, which is near 15000 more than in the year 1762. Was it owing to your having got a fresh recruit of learned men that you did so much more? Dr. *Hunt* might, however, have passed you a little Compliment upon this addition.

But his forgetfulness does not strike me so much as the celerity of his operations, and the penetration of his genius. What! could he examine in such a short time a collation, which you, with *six assistants*, were an whole year about? Could he there see, at the first glance of his eye, readings of considerable service to sacred Literature, when you and your *six assistants* in twelve months could find nothing but trifles and nonsense?

senle? What a man! Surely it must be in Manuscript, No. 68, that he found such excellent things? I gave an extract from it in my second Letter*.

But to return to your learned men. First, I am credibly informed, that the persons you employ at *Oxford* are very far from being fountains of knowledge; for you are fond of engaging only with young people, who do not understand a word of *Hebrew*; but you teach them the *Hebrew* and *Samaritan* Alphabet as soon as you can, and then set them to collate immediately.

I know you have a young man with you, who in the last war was a Sailor: very likely he finds it not so perilous to decypher old Manuscripts upon land as to strike the Main Sail at Sea.

I know, that between five and six years ago you enlisted a young man who was about fourteen years of age, if one may judge from his knowledge; for he could scarce read and write; but to make amends for that, he went off an errand special well.

You had another who was the son of a converted *Jew*. The Father was well learned in the *Hebrew*, and taught it many years at *Oxford*; He was very desirous of being employed by you, but you would never accept of him; you preferred the Son, a boy of about sixteen or seventeen years of age, who knew nothing of the matter. The reason of your choice is not difficult to discover; the Father was *learned*, and the Son *knew nothing*; a very sufficient reason why you should reject the former, and take the latter. Such, however, are the greatest part of the *learned men* you have about you, and who, without doubt, will be famous Doctors, when your new Bible makes it's appearance. Well, and can their claim to this title

* See page 21.

be disputed, when we consider that they are the persons who have collected together the subtil Vapours exhaled from your brain, and formed the cloud which is to water *England* with it's *most salutary doctrine*?

In regard to Manuscripts; I should like to be informed by what rule you judge whether they are worth collating or not. As I am unacquainted with it, and observe besides, that you consecrate the most paltry ones, provided they have any readings different from the printed Text, I will, for the last time, give you some directions on that head.

To collate faithfully, and to any good purpose, a person should be ready at the *sense* as well as the *letter* of the *Hebrew* Language; that he may distinguish a *different reading* from a *worthless mistake*.

He should be able to judge from the affinities of the Language, and the similitude of words, when he sees a *rasure*, what the word was before the alteration took place.

He ought to be thoroughly acquainted with the genius of the Language, and it's different modes of expression, in order to determine between the two Copies which he compares.

Lastly, the *whole tenour* of a Manuscript should be examined with the closest attention before it be admitted as of sufficient authority by which to correct any other. For if there really does occur in it a variation which seems to be of consequence; yet if it contains in other places a number of them that are exceeding weak and ignorant, and upon the whole is very incorrectly written, it ought to be rejected.

If you acted upon these principles, which you ought to do, it would be very commendable. And then, to remove every scruple, you should, when you publish your Bible (and I call upon you in the name of the *Christian* world to do it) first, cite the numbers

bers of the Manuscripts where you pretend to have discovered *Variations of great consequence*; and secondly, name the Libraries where they are to be found; that we may have it in our power to examine them, and see if you give all the Variations that occur in them. By these means we shall know how faithfully you have executed your Work. This is not a subject to be trifled with; the affair is of too serious a nature. But how greatly do I fear lest you should copy after the man, who, in your Capital, undertook to get into a Quart Bottle! or that other Doctor of your country, who was to publish a certain History in the *Arabic* Language, and whose Subscribers, after waiting twenty years, had the first Chapter to look for.

But perhaps you will say, that it is very bold and presumptuous in me to oppose a work patronized by so many illustrious personages, approved by the learned, and in vain attacked by the most able men of your own nation, whom you have compelled to retire in silence.

I anticipate this objection at once by saying, that it is neither boldness nor presumption on my part to attack a work which tends only more and more to obscure the *Hebrew* Language, and to supply *Infidels* with new weapons. You set fire to the Holy Scriptures on all sides: and I ring the alarm bell; can any thing be more natural?

I grant, that your work is patronized by the most illustrious names in *England*, and I think your manner of proceeding in that respect is extremely unjust. You ought not to impose on so many worthy men to whom you owe the profoundest respect. However good and valuable they may be, do they all understand *Hebrew*? Alas! Out of the whole number I should wish only one of them to be thoroughly acquainted with the Language, and to read over your two Dissertations

with impartiality and attention ; he would soon open the eyes of all your Subscribers.

Your Opponents have retired in silence. I allow it, but I forbear speaking on that head. Thank me for my prudence, and remember only, that the august name of his *Britannick* Majesty is at the head of your Subscribers ; that there was an Archbishop of *Canterbury* (one of the most respectable Prelates in *England*) who patronized you ; and that the silence of your Antagonists is not owing to the pretended solidity of your answers : this is sufficient, if you have a mind to understand me ; and I am not afraid of your constraining me to say more. Be assured, that I am well acquainted with what passed in *England* about six years ago with regard to you ; that I am no stranger to the dissatisfaction your undertaking gave to the truly learned men of your nation ; that they were ready at that time to demonstrate the falsehood of it, but a political fear put a stop to it.

These, Sir, are part of my reflections on your work : if you are desirous of any farther explanations, I am ready to give them you. For the present, permit me to sum up in few words the thoughts you have suggested to me.

CONCLUSION.

WHOEVER intends publishing any work, in which Religion is concerned, should be very careful to have it solid, learned and instructive. That yours has not these three qualities, I think is clearly proved from what I have already said, in which has been shewn, **First,** That it is useless ; and has nothing solid in it ;
for

for as you allow yourself, that the Errors, you fancy you discover in the Text, are found in places not immediately relative to the *faith* and *practice* of mankind, and the Doctrines and Morality of the Gospel are established beyond dispute, nothing can be more unseasonable and less to the purpose than to perplex the *Christian's* mind with informing him, that in such a word, which has nothing to do with his faith or salvation, there is a Letter omitted, or added, or transposed.

Secondly: That it is superficial; and indeed the weakness of it is discovered by your own reasonings, by the extravagant confidence you place in your Manuscripts, by your neglecting the use and application of the well known rules and genius of the *Hebrew* Language, and (which is a necessary consequence) by the numberless faults you imagine you find in it. Notwithstanding which, if there had been no other objection against your work, I should have observed the same silence in regard to you, as I did to Father *Houbigant*. For do not think, that I attack you, because you are an Englishman: no, Sir, my heart is a stranger to the base emotions of national Antipathy; and every worthy man is my brother and my friend. I did not take notice of Father *Houbigant* for the following reasons.

First: Because, after having extracted about seven or eight hundred faults, which he thought he had discovered in the Book of Psalms only, I found they were nothing more than so many reveries which were not worth disputing about, that the Text of his Psalms was of a piece with your ancient Manuscripts, and that it had in it *omissions*, and *additions* of words, sentences, and an whole verse; words which *had no sense any way* connected with the passages where they occurred; words which were not *Hebrew*, nor of any Language.

Lastly, that there were about 30 marginal Corrections of *Vander Hooght's* Psalms, which he had inserted in the Text.

Secondly: Because I discovered in his Work some Judaizing Principles. That, (for Example) instead of the word יהוה he chose to use אדני, or שדי, as the *Jews* usually do, that they may not pronounce the word יהוה.

E X A M P L E S.

VANDERHOOGHT.

F. HOUBIGANT.

Pf. XC. 17.	יהוה אלהינו	אדני אלהינו
CIV. 16.	יהוה	שדי
CXLII. 2.	יהוה	אדני

Thirdly and lastly, because I found that his Work made no impression on the Public, and that his Volumes *in folio* served only as Ornaments to some Libraries, where a place had been freely assigned them.

But as for you, Sir, you proclaim your own consequence with too much pomp; which makes your undertaking the more dangerous and alarming: and this is what remains for me now to prove.

We have in *France* (and perhaps it may have been refined upon in *England*) a new Religion, named *Materialism*. Though the daughter of vice and impiety, her success has not been the less rapid, nor the less considerable. Wisdom, honour, virtue, reason, religion, sentiment, all vanish before her. I will endeavour to give you some Idea of her.

At the beginning of this Century, reason was not wholly discarded. Every sensible man, who turned his thoughts inward, and reflected on his own existence, then argued:

Inde-

Independent of this flesh, which is only gross matter, and subject to dissolution, I am conscious of something within me, which enables me to think. Now this something surely is not matter; because let matter be ever so admirably organized, it cannot think: if this something is not matter, it must be spirit; for there is no medium between matter and spirit, and every being that exists is necessarily one or the other. If it is a spirit, it cannot be subject to the changes incident to matter, and consequently it cannot be destroyed like that by a dissolution of its parts (for a spirit is not capable of parts) but by annihilation only. If it cannot be destroyed but by annihilation, it must necessarily, after the dissolution of the matter to which it is united, either be annihilated, or continue to exist.

Nothing can create or annihilate itself. Therefore if my soul is annihilated, it must be by the same power which created it: but it is God only who can create and annihilate.

Therefore there is a God: if there is a God he must necessarily be eternal and infinitely perfect, for otherwise he would not be God: if he is perfect, he must be just; if he is just, he cannot annihilate my soul; because having created it free, rational, and with a power of action, he would offend against commutative justice, if he did not deal with it according to the use it had made of its reason and its liberty.

If it is contrary to one of the divine Attributes that my Soul be annihilated, then it will continue to exist. If it continues to exist, it is not to be doubted, that after the dissolution of the matter to which it is united by a Superior Will, the first effort of its liberty will be towards its center. But what is the Center of a created Spirit? It can be only the Eternal Spirit, God. It is to God therefore, that the Soul, when freed from the chains which hold it captive, will vigorously seek

to be united, as to the Center of its rest and happiness.

If God is the center of the happiness of my Soul, and if he will deal with it according to the use it shall have made of its reason and liberty, he is then at the same time my judge and my reward ; I ought therefore to invoke him, to worship him. What worship shall I render him ? That which I know will be acceptable to him. How shall I know what will be so ? By tradition, by the precepts of my forefathers, and especially by attending to these divine books, since they all teach me the worship I owe my benefactor, and the way by which my Soul may be united to God. I am therefore to invoke this benefactor, as he is the source and center of that happiness to which my soul by its nature necessarily tends, and to which it never can attain but by his help and goodness.

In this manner, till of late, did the sober-minded reason. But now every thing is changed. We no longer have a Soul, we are only meer machines, of a something better construction than a statue of marble, and that is all. There is now no God, or if there be, he is a Being wholly indolent, and who, concentrated in his own glory, is alike indifferent to our prayers and insensible of our affronts. Religion is no more, because the Books which contain it are only a collection of dreams : those who composed them are impostors ; and the wisest Laws, as well as the purest morality, which are there to be found, are nothing more than the product of political fanaticism.

Who would believe, that, in an age so enlightened, and, what is worse, in a *Christian* kingdom, such wild opinions could have gained admittance ? But yet they have, and the Disciples of this new System, after falling from one abyss to another, are now without God, without Soul, without Religion, and even with-

our

out reason; these however are the Beings which call themselves Philosophers. Can there be a more unworthy profanation of such a noble name than the conferring it on brutes, machines, in short, automatas, to whom wisdom is a chimera, virtue a plantom, and the greatest of crimes meer Sport?

I mention these Anecdotes, Sir, which are so disgraceful to the Nation only to shew you how dangerous in the present age your undertaking is. You know, that one of the arguments most confidently made use of against the *Christian* Religion is the obscurity of the sacred Writings. What matter of triumph will it be to our Infidels, when they learn from your Works, that the very original of the Versions is absolutely corrupted! Depend upon it, they will abide by that determination, and laugh at your promises to restore it to its ancient purity, and perhaps will soon write Dissertations at random on the *Hebrew* Language, which they do not understand, as they do on many subjects about which they know nothing. What, Sir! at a time when, through an imaginary fear of increasing the rage of infidelity still more, it is reckoned almost a Crime for the devoutest *Christians* to give their opinion on the method of interpreting the Sacred Writings, and of proving clearly their holiness and excellence, do you stand forth to proclaim to us their corruption? Give me leave to tell you, that you are putting into the hands of Infidels a Buckler, under shelter of which they will repel the sharpest arrows of reason, faith, and religion.

I have the honour to be, Sir, &c.

P O S T S C R I P T.

WHILST this Work was in the Press, I met with a Letter of Dr. Kennicott, dated from the Hay-Market the 22d of May 1770, and inserted in the *Avant-Coureur* under the Article of *Literary News*. This piece gave occasion to a few reflections, which entirely corresponding with this Work, I think it proper to publish them. Dr. Kennicott thus expresses himself.

“ You ask what is the object of my researches after the Hebrew Bible, and I will satisfy you. I have sent at my expence a Man of Letters, named M. Paul Jacob Bruns, of Lubeck, who is to pass through Paris, go along the borders of the Rhine, through Switzerland, Italy, Germany and Holland, and he will consequently visit the Synagogues of STRASBURG, Francfort, Worms, Venice, Amsterdam.”

I know not how much money the Doctor gave his Envoy for his journey; but he would have done well to have added to it some hundreds of pounds more to build a Synagogue at Strasburg: for there is none there at present, nor does even any Jew live in that City: they have not so much as the liberty of going and staying there a day without paying for it; and they dare not continue in the Town all night. Every body is acquainted with this circumstance; how came the Doctor not to know it?

“ He will examine all the Manuscripts of the Hebrew Bible, or parts of the Bible, which are prior to printing;

“ printing; and the most ancient will deserve the
 “ greatest attention, as being nearest to the fountain.”

Suppose that the *Lubecques* Envoy should have access to all the Synagogues of the different Countries in *Europe*, through which he has orders to pass, what will he find there? Only some rolls of the *Pentateuch*, which will likewise have the same Corruptions in them, as the *Doctor* imagines he has discovered in the printed *Hebrew Pentateuch*; and I challenge him to produce any Manuscript from the *Jewish Synagogues*, which differs from the printed *Pentateuch*, in the important passages that he says are corrupted. In regard to the Rolls of *Esther*, the *Doctor* does not know, it seems, that they are not preserved in the Synagogues; that the *Jews* keep them in their houses, and never carry them to the Synagogue except on the day of their *Carnival*, which is the only day in the year they read that History there. He should fully acquaint his Envoy with these trifling circumstances; though perhaps, after all, the Envoy may be more knowing in that respect than his Principal.

The *Doctor* recommends it to his Deputy to examine all the Manuscripts that are prior to printing. Such an Order is not difficult to give; but will he find many of that sort? The Question is rather problematical; let us try to resolve it.

It is a matter of fact that before the invention of printing the *Jews* had a great number of Manuscripts of the whole Bible, which they were very careful to preserve and hand down to their descendants from family to family. They were good, ancient, and nearer to the fountain head, than any of those which Dr. *Kennicott* could find at present in the Libraries of the *Christians* in *Europe*. These Manuscripts now subsist no longer, and, if they did, they would not be to be found

found at *Venice* or *Strasburg*, but in the seven *Jewish* Congregations, of which I am about to speak.

It must be known then, that there are no Kingdoms in the world which have been so peopled with *Jews*, and *learned Jews* as those of *Spain* and *Portugal*. After having resided there whole ages, they were banished; and it is out of the remains of that wandering nation, driven from those two Empires, that the seven *Jewish* Congregations of *Bordeaux*, *Bayonne*, *Livonia*, *London*, *Amsterdam*, the *Hague*, and *Hamburg* were formed. These would be the proper places to find good ancient Manuscripts of the whole Bible, had they not been in great measure lost at the time these people were banished. Besides, it is certain that, since the invention of printing, the *Jews* have troubled themselves very little about Manuscripts, because the printed Bibles satisfy them. *Ximenes's* Bible was printed under their inspection, and from the most ancient and correct of their Manuscripts. Will the *Doctor* make us believe, that an whole nation, so interested as the *Jewish* in the preservation of a book which contains the Religion they profess, would have been silent, if they had seen it printed differently from the Manuscripts? That is not consistent with good Sense. I say therefore that the *Doctor* is now taking an unnecessary step, and putting himself to a needless expence.

First: Because, if we except the *Pentateuch* and the Book of *Esther*, which the *Jews* always keep in Manuscript, the former in their Synagogues, and the latter in their houses, under a Rabbinical pretext that *Moses* gave them the five Books written with his own hand, and that the Book of *Esther* was delivered to them in the hand-writing of *Mordecai* and *Esther*, his Envoy will rarely find any other Manuscripts among them; for, except the two Books we have just mentioned, they make

make use of the printed Bible for the Prophets, and the other Books.

Secondly : Because, supposing he should find some, he will see, if he will only take the trouble to examine them, that they agree exactly, word for word, with the Manuscripts that are in the *three or four London Synagogues*.

“ This Work (continues Dr. Kennicott) has been carrying on ten years already, under the patronage of the King of *England*, with the assistance of the principal *Jews* in *England*, and many others.”

That the King of *England* patronizes Dr. Kennicott's Work may be true ; and indeed his Royal Name appears at the head of the Subscribers. But what then ? Why, it reflects great honour to be sure on the Workman, but it does not add one grain of goodness to the Work : and besides are not Kings imposed on every day as well as private persons ? As to the assistance of the principal *Jews*, that assertion is rather too bold, and the *Doctor* must certainly be thinking of something else, when he committed it to writing. I have it in my power to prove that from the beginning of his undertaking till the year 1767, he had no *Jew* whatever working under him, for he had only a *Sailor*, and some *young people* who did not know how to read *Hebrew*. If he has employed any of them about his Work since the year 1767, it is more than I know, and what I shall not pretend to dispute with him.

“ My undertaking has been censured by some *Jews*.”

I am not surpris'd that Dr. Kennicott's undertaking has been censured by some *Jews*, but I am extremely so, that it is not condemned and detested by all the *Jews* in general ; for the whole nation ought to resent the being accused of having wilfully corrupted the Bible ; the only Book which contains their *Faith* and

Reli-

Religion ; for which they have always had the greatest veneration, and which they are forbidden to add to, or diminish from, under the severest penalties.

“ And approved by others.”

That is what I shall never believe ; because if Dr. *Kennicott* had really found admirers among the principal *Jews*, he would not have failed to have shewn them off in the States of his Collations : which he exhibits every year, decorated with the names of a Croud of *Christian* Admirers who do not understand *Hebrew*, and is it likely he would have forgot to set down the names of those who are learned in that Language ? It would have been perhaps the only way to gain some kind of reputation to his Work. No, *Doctor*, you will not find a single *Jew* who approves your undertaking, all in general disliking and condemning it, unless you have begged the approbation of some *Jews*, who have renounced their Religion for interest. In that case they will extol you as highly as you could wish ; and on the same principle will fabricate for you some Manuscripts of the greatest Antiquity. Pay them well, and you will soon have a Pentateuch in the hand writing of *Moses* himself, and other Books of the Bible written by *Ezra*, or by *Hillel*.

Dr. *Kennicott* concludes his Letter with saying, “ that his undertaking ought not to displease any one ; “ since his only aim is to establish the truth and settle “ the very words of *Moses* and the Prophets.”

That is an argument, for instance, to which I would not willingly give a name. What ! during these eighteen hundred years that *Moses* and the Prophets have been in the hands of so many learned men, has no one yet been able to establish the truth, and settle the very words of their writings ; and was it necessary that providence should raise up Dr. *Kennicott* for that purpose ? Such Language is rather too strong.

The

The Doctor must excuse my telling him that the *Christian* world will never leave that point to his judgment; it is fully satisfied with the printed Text; and all considerate people, whether *Christians* or *Jews*, will ever with indignation see him so presumptuously handle the sacred Book. Let him not take it amiss then, if I assert that his proposition is entirely false; that his undertaking ought to disgust every body, because it is rash, and calculated only to do infinite mischief to Religion by unseasonably spreading clouds over the purity, the authenticity, and verity of our printed Bibles. I say farther, that it is chimerical, and impossible to be put in execution; because to accomplish it, we must necessarily have the original Manuscripts of the Bible, those written by *Moses himself*, by the Prophets and Authors of the sacred Books. But, if the Doctor search the Archives in the four quarters of the world, most assuredly he will not find them; and however ancient be the real or fictitious date of a Manuscript, it will always be many ages posterior to them; and consequently we shall both of us ever be in the situation we are at present; he to find wretched Variations by thousands, which he will proclaim as of great consequence, and with which he will swell his Collations; and I, to maintain, that the Manuscript, however ancient it be, is not preferable to those which Cardinal *Ximenes* made use of for printing the Bible.

It is in vain therefore for Dr. *Kennicott* to recommend, among others, the Manuscripts of the *Escorial*, and some other places in *Spain*, and for this reason: either they were in being in the time of *Ximenes*, or they were not; if they were in being, no doubt the *Spanish Cardinal* made use of them for printing the Bible, and then the Doctor cannot consistently receive them, because by his account they concurred in the corruption of the sacred Books: if they were not in being, then they

they have been fabricated since printing, and consequently no credit ought to be given to them.

Before I conclude, I must acquaint the Public with a little anecdote which deserves their attention. Dr. Kennicott, when he was at *Paris*, went to the Library at the *Sorbonne*, and there chose out 28 Manuscripts, which he thought might favour his project of correcting the Bible. It is to be observed, that, among these 28 Manuscripts, there are three of them, namely, No. 25, 28, and 254. written in Rabbinical Characters, of which the Doctor actually cannot read one word; and what is remarkable is, that at the same time he rejected No. 20, which is a Bible written in the same Characters. Let him tell me then for what reason he disgraces this poor No. 20, and pays so much respect to his brethren, who perhaps do not deserve it, and with whose Character he is not at all better acquainted?

To sum up the whole then, I say :

Dr. Kennicott, in the present circumstances, could not take a step more hazardous to his own reputation, and that of his undertaking, than to send Mr. Paul Jacob Bruns, of *Lubeck*, to ramble about in this manner from one country to another. And the reason is; because it is evident that it is only to gain time, and lull his Subscribers asleep. It is very surprizing, that after proclaiming his work so loudly for more than ten years, and incessantly stunning the Public with the excellence of above 400 Manuscripts, which are to serve for correcting the printed Text, he should still be obliged to send an express to look for more of them through the whole habitable world. If 400 Manuscripts, that are represented as so valuable, are not sufficient to correct the Bible, *five thousand* will not answer the purpose. But in short, suppose that Mr. Bruns after having traversed *Europe* at the expence of Dr. Kennicott's Subscribers, and been absent three or
four

four years, should return, and bring back with him really a good packet of ancient Manuscripts, whether true or false, it does not signify, will the work at last see the light? No. Some years more will be spent in picking and culling these new Comers; a set of wretched variations will be extracted from them, with which great care will be taken to decorate yearly a state of the Collations, approved in particular by Dr. Hunt; and when Dr. Kennicott's Students have nothing more to do, he will inform his Subscribers by the way of the *Avant-Coureur*, that he is going to dispatch a new emissary, at his expence to Mount Nebo, to look for the Cave where the Prophet *Jeremiah* shut up the *Ark of the Covenant*, and to take out the Pentateuch, that was written by *Moses himself*, which has been preserved there above 2350 years. That is the Course which Dr. Kennicott will take; and what will be the end of all this bustle?

Parturient Montes, nascetur ridiculus Mus.

I have nothing more to say, Sir, except to reply.

If I crave your attention before my work's ended, Perhaps you'll soon shew me how much you're offended. Believe then, (although you may think what you list on't) I have written with more than a single assistant. For the wisest of Jews and of Christians have thought, All your labour is vain, and will soon come to nought.

Parody on Racine

AN

A N

A P P E N D I X

B Y T H E

T R A N S L A T O R.

WHILE the Translation of the *French Letters* was in the Press, Dr. Kennicott's Proposals came to my hand for printing his Edition of the *Hebrew Bible*, at the price of eight Guineas. I think it proper to spend a few words upon these Proposals, that the Reader may be acquainted with their complexion. The Doctor's grand Design is here recommended with the same pomp and sophistry as usual, but with some farther disadvantages. He begins with inculcating what he has so often insisted upon before, that the Bible must be liable to corruptions by Transcribers, like other books. But here he conceals a difference which deserves a sacred regard. Neither Prophets nor Priests were ever appointed as Conservators of the Text of *Homer*, *Herodotus*, or *Hippocrates*; neither were Kings bound by the laws of their Religion to transcribe them; neither were the municipal laws of the kingdom, in which they were kept, administered out of them. These and many other distinctions, wisely ordained by the providence of God, should make us cease to wonder, if there are fewer errors in the sacred Volume than in the Works of profane Writers; and it is both irreverent and injudicious to put them on a level. Bishop Walton well observed (and it must indeed be obvious to every considerate person) that the sacred
Text

Text was certainly left in a perfect state by the prophet *Ezra*; which observation cuts up by the roots a fundamental and favourite principle of Dr. *Kennicott*, that the *older* any writings are *, the more mistakes have been made by the Transcribers. The learned *Walton* has farther observed, that the *Masora*, which registered even the single Letters of the sacred Books, is supposed to have commenced about the age of the *Maccabees*, when the Pharisaical spirit arose of dwelling so minutely on the outside shell or letter of the law, and neglecting the weightier matters contained within it. Some parts of the *Masora* were certainly extant in the third century, before the writing of the *Jewish Talmud*. So that the Text of the *Hebrew Bible* has been secured in a manner different from all other books in the world; but of these things the Doctor saith little to the purpose, and is always throwing cold water upon the *Masora*.

However, let us allow his principle, and see what will follow. The more frequently a book is transcribed, says he, the more will be the mistakes of the Transcribers. Be it so: therefore he rakes together all the Copies he can find upon the face of the Earth, that he may have as many errors as possible to chuse out of. The more copies, the more errors; for new Transcripts cannot shew us a new Bible; they can only, as the Doctor has rightly observed, multiply the adulterations of the old. And is not this now an hopeful undertaking upon Dr. *Kennicott's* own principles? If I desired to see a corrupted Author corrected, I would take another method; and let us suppose this Author to be *Virgil*. Few writings have been transcribed and printed oftener than his. What shall we do then?

* See the Account of the Collations at the end of the year 1760.

Shall we run about to all the Schools in England, and pick up *Virgil's* old and new from the School-boys (as the Doctor sends his Agents to the modern *Jewish Synagogues*) that out of all the mistakes of the Press, and the nonsense of false stoppings, we may raise a pure Text of *Virgil*? Shall we not rather prefer a few Copies, and the fewer the better, provided they are ancient and carefully written, to all the trash above-mentioned; and will not this way be more likely to lead us to the true Text of *Virgil*? Two good Copies of *Virgil* might transmit his Works in sufficient purity from the Reign of *Augustus* to that of *George the Third*. In the Vatican there is a Copy of *Virgil* older than the Emperor *Theodosius*, and another supposed to be nearly as old as the *Christian* æra. Either of these might be taken from a Copy written in the lifetime of *Virgil* himself; and two such Copies would transmit *Virgil* to the present age more securely than two thousand. I grant that even in such there will be slips of the pen, which the grammar of the passage, or the measure of the verse may enable any body to correct. But when copies are greatly multiplied, the case is different; for then we have not only the carelessness of Transcribers to contend with, but the impertinence of adventurous Critics, who have taken upon them to correct errors without judgment, or have moulded to their own fancy such passages as seemed to be false on account of some obscurity they were not qualified to remove: and the more you have of such Copies, the more remote you will be from the genuine Text of *Virgil*.

The more simple and rational of these methods was pursued (as far as it could be) by Cardinal *Ximenes* and his converted *Jewish* Assistants, above two hundred years ago; they took the *oldest* and *purest* Copies the world then afforded, and have exhibited an *Hebrew* Text,

Text, which when compared with the ancient Versions, will preserve the Old Testament to us in sufficient purity to the world's end.

The latter method was preferred about twelve years ago by Dr. Kennicott; who discovered (as these last proposals inform us) that there were preserved at Oxford many Manuscripts of the Hebrew Bible, differing greatly from each other. From this mutual disagreement in the Copies, he conceived hopes, that we might one day or other have a purer Hebrew Text: but surely without any reason. In concurring testimony there is some evidence; but dissentient testimony leaves us more uncertain than we were before. Yet this dissentient testimony has been the great object of Dr. Kennicott's researches; who seems among his other discoveries to have adopted it as a maxim, that he who sows in uncertainty will reap in precision. Therefore his original design was to repair the word of God by fabricating a new Text out of all this lumber: but happily that plan is dropt, and he now proposes to give us the old Text, as in *Vander Hooght's* Edition, with all his extracts from Manuscripts in the Margin: so that his Bible, if the Press is well attended, may at last be as good as *Vander Hooght's*, except that it will be abundantly more unwieldy in the using, and expensive in the purchase.

To convince us more than ever of the expediency of his work for the advancement of *Christian Literature*, he propagates the following evil report against the Old Testament; that *it may be presumed the alterations which have gained admission into the present Text have given the chief strength to the objections of unbelievers.* The Author of the Proposals did not consider how dangerous it is to say this, unless he can actually specify such alterations and correct them indubitably. He puts the Infidels in possession of the Old Testament; and if

you chuse to deposit eight guineas, perhaps you may see (at the *Greek Calends*) whether he is able to get it out of their hands again. But where does he find the alterations which gave strength to the objections of *Collins*, *Tindal*, or *Middleton*? I question whether any of them understood a single verse of the *Hebrew Bible*. Their method was to set up heathen books and heathen principles, in opposition to the Scripture. But the Doctor only says, *it may be presumed*. The subject has been before him for a dozen years; and after all his enquiries he has nothing but *presumption* for a report so scandalous to the credit of the *Old Testament*: for which we ought to be thankful.

It was observed above, that Dr. *Kennicott* sends about to the *Jewish Synagogues*, and *Jewish Rabbies* for a sight of their Collections: which is an unaccountable proceeding, if we remember what he has inculcated upon other occasions. Sometimes we hear him complaining, that the advantage of being collated with ancient Manuscripts has been readily granted to all Books but the *Hebrew Bible*: which complaint he knew to be false when he published it. At other times he objects, that when Cardinal *Ximenes* collated ancient Manuscripts, he made use only of the worst copies, because he was assisted by men who had formerly been *Jews*. Yet this same Dr. *Kennicott* now rejoices, that his agent Mr. *Bruns* enjoys one singular privilege, that of examining Manuscripts belonging to the *Synagogues* and *learned Jews*. These are the terms of his new Proposals. Nay; he has gone much farther; he now holds up the *Jews* as a pattern to all those *Christians*, who are still so incredulous as to doubt the expediency of his undertaking: the ideas of these *Jews*, says he, must have great influence on the minds of many *Christians*. If after all Dr. *Kennicott* has said, there be any manner of man who does not believe, that he is employed

employed to the Glory of God and the advancement of the *Christian* Faith, let him go and ask the *Jews*; for they have favoured the undertaking with *two very honourable Letters in Hebrew to their foreign brethren*. And does he, who objected to the interposition of converted *Jews*, think this circumstance so very much for his honour? *Sic notus Ulysses?* *Christians*, who are really concerned for the honour of God's Word, will rather be inclined to express their apprehensions in the terms of an unfortunate friend to his country—*Timeo Danaos & dona ferentes*. The *Jews* have been inventing fables and subterfuges for above a thousand years, to defeat all the attempts of the Ministers of *Christ*, and to fortify themselves in their unbelief: and are they now of a sudden become enamoured of the labours of a *Christian* Divine? What views can they have in giving encouragement to his Work, unless they suppose he is bringing into the *Christian* Church a *Trojan* horse, replete with the instruments of discord and scepticism? At least, if no other ill purpose is promoted by it, this effect may naturally arise, that *Christian* Scholars may be tempted to waste their time in picking and sifting of Letters, like the *Pharisees* of old; till the Scripture, instead of being applied as the power of God to Salvation, (and such it is in every version of it) shall dwindle into a lifeless and barren object of Criticism: and then the *Jews* may see some part of their wishes accomplished—*Hoc Ithacus velit, & magno mercentur Atrida*. Some late libertine publications, by those who are in the new correcting interest, have shewn but too plainly, that these suspicions are not altogether groundless.

Dr. Kennicott has been charged with carrying himself indiscriminately toward all Manuscripts, without any regard to their worth and authenticity. In these proposals he defends his conduct, and openly avows
the

principle, affirming it to be an *absurd alteration*; whether the Manuscripts used for this Work, are or are not well chosen. Had the Manuscripts been few in number, and judiciously distinguished, the Work would have been of much more value, and might have been executed in one fifth part of the time: but this plan, perhaps, would not have answered the Collator's purpose so well in some other respects; therefore he has taken up this shocking opinion, that if the Text is but altered, it matters not from whence or from what—the *alteration is absurd!*

These Proposals have now given us some further light into the principles and practices of this modern Restorer of the *Hebrew Code*. He has brought an accusation against the Bible, that it gives strength to the objections of unbelievers; though he is not able to shew this with regard to any single instance; and by introducing Manuscripts, good, bad, and indifferent, without distinction, he exposes it's Text to be corrupted (which he calls *corrected*) by the blunders of ignorance and barbarism.

When I reflect how this undertaking has been patronized by Princes, Prelates, and Universities, I seem to myself profane in entertaining any disrespectful sentiments of it, and feel as if I ought to hide my head amongst the malignant Cavillers of the age. When I review some of the names of Dr. Kennicott's Subscribers, I am almost persuaded to renounce my own judgment, and confess, that the design, to which *they* have given their sanction, must be serviceable to the interests of Christianity. But when I examine things as they are in themselves, independent of all that is external and ornamental: when I consider the Assurance, Absurdity, and Ostentation of the Undertaker, how he shuffles, disguises, and falsifies; how he affects to honour the Scripture, while he is pouring contempt upon it;

it; how he extols as absolutely necessary a work absolutely superfluous; how he denies the *Hebrew Text* to have been collated with ancient Manuscripts, and then objects to some, who were concerned in collating it, because they had been *Jews*; how he values the privilege of searching modern Synagogues, and the honour of being assisted by *Jews*, who are still in their unbelief; how he pacifies his Readers by telling them there are no such variations as affect matters of faith and practice, and then triumphs in imaginary alterations which give strength to the objections of Unbelievers; when I consider and compare these and many other glaring inconsistencies, I am then obliged to conclude, that however pious his Subscribers may be in their intentions, they have undesignedly verified what *Potiphar's Wife* falsely pretended against *Joseph*—*they have brought in an Hebrew unto us, to mock us.*

F I N I S.

ERRATA.

- Page 9. l. 33. Instead of XL. read XI.
 25. l. 4. *Sixthly*, omitted before, *These are likewise, &c.*
 31. l. 15. for כח read חל, in the second column.
 48. l. 2. for 16 read 6.
 54. l. 9. בנתקה omitted after חת.
 109. l. 25. after *Hunt*, for comma put interrogation.